









Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



RTheol.  
P

AUTHENTIC REPORT  
OF THE  
DISCUSSION  
ON  
THE UNITARIAN CONTROVERSY  
BETWEEN  
JOHN SCOTT PORTER, D.D.  
MINISTER OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATION, BELFAST  
AND  
DANIEL BAGOT, D.D.  
NOW DEAN OF DROMORE AND VICAR OF NEWRY,  
HELD ON APRIL 14, 1834, AND THREE FOLLOWING DAYS,  
IN THE MEETING-HOUSE OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN  
CONGREGATION, BELFAST.

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON: R. GROOMBRIDGE AND SONS.  
DUBLIN: G. HERBERT. EDINBURGH: R. GRANT AND SON.  
BELFAST: PHILLIPS AND SONS; AITCHISON,  
NEWRY: J. WARNOCK AND CO.  
*AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.*

4309  
25-9/96

## PREFATORY NOTICE.

---

THIS Discussion, which excited much public interest, commenced on Monday, the 14th April, 1834, at half-past 10 o'clock. MICHAEL ANDREWS, Esq. of Ardoyne, and CONWAY RICHARD DOBBS, Esq. of Acton, now of Castle Dobbs, near Carrickfergus, were Chairmen on the occasion.

The following is a statement of the Propositions which constituted the Subject of Discussion on each side, of the Standard of Reference, and the Rules by which the business was conducted.

### *Mr Porter's Propositions:*

1. There is one self-existent God, the Father: who is God alone; to the entire exclusion of the alleged proper Deity of the Word.

2. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is (even in his highest capacity, nature, or condition) a Created Being, deriving his existence, wisdom, power, and authority, from the Father; and inferior to him in these and all other attributes.

### *Mr Bagot's Propositions:*

1. There is one God, Jehovah, who is God only, to the entire exclusion of the alleged Godhead of every creature.

2. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator, is the Word made flesh, perfect God and perfect man; possessing, as the Word, the same eternity, knowledge, power, authority, prerogatives, and Godhead, with the Father, and one with him in all attributes.

## STANDARD OF REFERENCE.

The Word of God contained in the books of the Old and New Testament, which are received into the Authorised Version, admitting them all to be canonical. The correctness or incorrectness of passages marked as spurious in Griesbach's last edition, and the translation or signification of any particular words or passages, to be open to question and legitimate criticism. The divine authority of Scripture to be admitted on both sides. And all quotations to be given in chapter and verse, according to the divisions of the Authorised Translation in common use.

## REGULATIONS.

1. The discussion to commence on MONDAY, the 14th of April, and to continue for that and the three following days.

2. The discussion to continue for four hours each day : the time on the first day to be divided into two equal portions, and each to give a statement and proof of the affirmative propositions on his side.

3. It is to be determined by lot, on the first day of discussion, who is to open the debate.

4. On each of the two following days the speakers are to address the meeting forty minutes alternately, a pause of ten minutes being allowed between each address, during which any question may be asked in explanation of what the last speaker had said. The person who closes one day's discussion is to commence on the following.

5. The discussion to be held in Belfast, in the most suitable place that can be obtained.

6. Two Chairmen to preside each day, one chosen by each party, with power to put a peremptory stop to anything disorderly, and of excluding from the place of meeting any one who transgresses the rules.

7. Each day's meeting to commence at eleven o'clock, except the first, which is to commence at half-past ten, to allow the Chairmen to make any necessary explanations ; and any time lost during any day's discussion to be added to the regular period of closing the business of the day.

8. Admission to be by tickets, for which the sum of 4s. each shall be charged, and which shall admit to the entire discussion. In case of any room remaining, tickets for one day's discussion, at 1s. 6d. each, shall be sold; but not before the Saturday preceding. The money received to be expended in defraying the necessary expense; and, if not sufficient for that purpose, each shall be liable for one half the sum deficient.

9. No signs of approbation or disapprobation to be allowed; and no person whatever to be permitted to address the meeting, except the speakers or the Chairmen, to a point of order; and no person to interrupt, in any way, the speakers; but each may have a friend to assist him in looking for references, and marking them.

10. One Reporter to be employed, who shall be admonished and expected to do equal justice to both parties in the discussion, and his expenses to be defrayed out of the produce of the sale of tickets. Each speaker to write out a full report of his own speeches from the Reporter's notes; which, when approved by the other party, shall be jointly published; but neither to be allowed to introduce any new matter, nor to suppress any argument actually adduced, nor any statement actually advanced; and each to consider himself pledged not to sanction the publication of a report of any one side of the discussion unaccompanied by the other.

11. On the fourth day of discussion each speaker to make one speech of forty minutes' length; an adjournment for half an hour then to take place, after which each shall be allowed to make a closing speech of one hour, the report of which shall supersede the Appendix formerly proposed.

12. The tickets to be equally divided between Mr BAGOT and Mr PORTER, and to be sold at the price above stated; each to account for the number of tickets received, but to be at liberty to give away twenty tickets for the entire meeting to his personal friends.

13. The execution of the above arrangements, and of all minor regulations, to be intrusted to Messrs John Campbell and John Marshall, who may call in a third party, by mutual agreement, in case of any difference of opinion.

*We agree to the foregoing,*

DANIEL BAGOT.

J. SCOTT PORTER.

*We hereby certify that the foregoing Report contains a full, faithful, and accurate account of our respective Addresses at the late Discussion; and that no other can be genuine or authentic.*

*Signed this 21st day of May 1834.*

J. SCOTT PORTER.

DANIEL BAGOT.

---

*I hereby certify that this Report of the Discussion between the Rev. DANIEL BAGOT and the Rev. J. SCOTT PORTER, conducted in Belfast on Monday the 14th April 1834, and the three following days, is, in every respect, genuine and authentic,—that no other Report can be so, as this agrees with the shorthand note of the whole proceedings—including criticisms, quotations, references, &c. &c,—taken by me,*

MICHAEL HANLY.

23 Dominick Street, Dublin,  
May 21, 1834.

# UNITARIAN DISCUSSION.

---

## FIRST DAY.

MR PORTER.—*Ladies and Gentlemen*—It has fallen to my lot to address you first on this occasion ; and, without any formal preface, I proceed at once to the business which has brought us together this day.

You are aware that the present controversy has arisen in consequence of a notice which my reverend opponent caused to be inserted in the *Northern Whig* of Monday, January 20, 1834, which was to this effect :—

THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY.—The Rev. Daniel Bagot, it will be seen by an advertisement, has published an abstract of controversial sermons, lately preached by him in this town. He has requested us to suggest to the Unitarians, that they should publish a similar tract, in the same form, containing, concisely, their arguments in reply to his abstract. We readily do this ; and we would have added, had Mr Bagot not got so soon before the public, that both tracts should have been stitched together, and sold at a very low price. As journalists, we have nothing to do with either party ; but, as we wish that truth should predominate, on whatever side it may be, we would readily concur in any fair proposition which might tend to settle the great questions at issue.

Having the honour and happiness to be a minister of the Gospel of that persuasion to which this invitation was publicly addressed, it appeared to me that I could not, with propriety, omit taking notice of the



challenge in some way or other. Had I allowed it to pass disregarded, I should not only have treated with disrespect an intimation proceeding from a gentleman, whose bland deportment and controversial candour I have always most readily acknowledged, but I should likewise have given occasion to any who might be so disposed, to insinuate that the Unitarian ministers of this town—though sufficiently open and sufficiently eager to propound their doctrines, when no direct attack upon them was to be apprehended—shrank away from avowing and defending their opinions, when they would necessarily be contrasted with tenets of an opposite description ; and I have no doubt whatever the inference would have been drawn, and pointedly stated, that this reluctance proceeded from a secret consciousness that our principles would not bear the light of open discussion. I could not, in conscience and in honour, give ground for these suspicions. Convinced, as I am most firmly, that the tenets which I have embraced are the solemn truths of the Gospel—firmly built on the solid foundation of prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone—I dare not allow them, by any remissness or indolence on my part, to receive a wound. This would have been to abandon my post in the time of danger—to turn my back upon the standard of Christ at the moment when the tide of battle rolled on directly against it. Convinced, besides, as I am, by the study of history, and by what little I have learned of mental changes, that in an enlightened age, and with increasing facilities for public instruction, free, open discussion cannot but conduce to the discovery and extension of truth, I felt myself bound to accept the proposal of Mr Bagot in some form or other ; for I cannot doubt that the means of religious information are so plentifully diffused by a benignant Providence, that if men could only be induced to employ them, the result must be the progress of truth : and it is as a means of rousing men to think,

to inquire, to weigh evidence, and judge for themselves, that I deem discussion and controversy mainly valuable.

But while, for these reasons, I thought myself bound to take some notice of Mr Bagot's proposal, other considerations, of no small weight, as they seemed to me, rendered it inexpedient to accept his invitation in the precise terms in which it was conveyed. Had I simply accepted his challenge, and published a pamphlet in reply to his *Abstract*, it did appear to me, as it has appeared to all of every side of the question with whom I have since conversed, that I should have done so at a decided disadvantage. For you must all be perfectly aware that, while persons of Unitarian sentiments feel, in general, little or no objection to read productions in which their tenets are impugned, there exists in the minds of a considerable number of the opposite persuasion a very great reluctance to peruse tracts in opposition to their own views. Had Mr Bagot, indeed, delayed the publication of his tract until it could have been issued in conjunction with a reply of the kind suggested, so that both might have been circulated together, and so that every person who obtained the one must, of necessity, have procured the other at the same time, I should have been most happy to embrace the opportunity of carrying on the controversy with one whose temper and candour, as displayed in the only discourse I had ever heard him preach, had made upon me a most favourable impression. But, this opportunity not being allowed me, I thought it would have been a mere waste of time and trouble to publish a separate tract, which I very well knew would never make its way into the hands of those whose opinions and views I was, as will readily be conceived, most desirous of combating. Acting under this impression, which everything that has since occurred has only tended to deepen, I published a letter in the *Northern Whig* of Thursday, January 23, in which, after stating the rea-

sons which induced me to decline taking the step which he suggested, I went on to say—

If, however, Mr Bagot is desirous of circulating the facts and arguments, on both sides of the question, fairly among the public, both Unitarian and Trinitarian—I, as an individual, propose to him two methods of doing so, either of which will answer the purpose.

I am ready to publish a series of Essays on the Doctrine of the Trinity, from his pen, in the new series of *The Bible Christian*; inserting, at the same time, illustrative comments; and subjecting both him and his antagonist, whoever he may be, to the conditions specified by the former conductors in reply to his note. Or, if he prefer it, I am willing to meet him in Belfast, in an amicable discussion on the subject; time, place, and other preliminaries, to be settled by friends mutually chosen; the only stipulation on which I insist being, that an authentic report of the entire debate shall be prepared and published at our joint expense.

Mr Bagot declined assenting to my first proposal—the publication of a series of essays in the *Bible Christian*, but accepted my second, a *viva voce* debate; and terms and preliminaries having been subsequently settled, we appear before you this day to urge the leading arguments for our respective views of the Christian Doctrine. And I can safely say for myself, that while I come forward with a heartfelt sense, both of the truth and the importance of that doctrine, which I stand here this day to advocate, I come forward, likewise, with perfect charity—nay, with real cordiality—not only for the bulk of those persons who differ from my views, but for my reverend opponent in particular; and giving him entire credit for the same feelings that actuate myself, I shall endeavour, and I hope successfully, to avoid every expression that could possibly give him offence, or sound unkindly in his ears. It is needless to say, that I shall endeavour to discuss the serious and important question on which we are at issue with calmness and seriousness of mind. I shall not certainly consider myself precluded from expressing warmly what I feel strongly respecting the unscriptural

character and tendency of the doctrine which I impugn ; for I will not sacrifice my paramount regard to the interests of divine truth out of deference to him, or affected complaisance to any one. But ridicule, misrepresentation, and invective, I shall studiously avoid. The subject is too weighty to be made the groundwork of a jest, even when it is most completely misunderstood ; and the religious convictions of an honest mind, even when most erroneous, are with me a matter too sacred to be treated with levity.

After these introductory remarks, I proceed to make my observations upon the Standard of Reference and upon the Propositions, which you will find given at large in the handbill that has been widely circulated.

You will observe that we have agreed to argue on the basis of the "*Word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which are received into the Authorised Version, admitting them all to be canonical.*" In the propriety of adopting this standard, I beg it may be distinctly understood by all persons and parties that I do most entirely and cordially concur. Indeed, no Unitarian could consistently or conscientiously argue the question upon any other basis. Let it be understood with the same distinctness, that if I had presumed to defend our common doctrines with any other weapons, my fellow-Unitarians would have disowned my procedure, and exclaimed against me as guilty of betraying the good cause which I have undertaken to maintain into the hands of the opponents. For it is on Scriptural grounds that we have embraced our characteristic doctrine. We are Unitarians solely and simply because we can find no doctrine but Unitarianism in the Bible, which is our rule of faith and only accredited standard. So far from rejecting the testimony of divine revelation on this or any subject, we bow to it with entire reverence ; and are ready at any moment to repudiate our present views, if they can be shown to be inconsistent with the

divine record. Nor was there ever a more unfounded accusation than that which was frequently preferred against us in former times—and is sometimes even yet covertly insinuated—that we undervalue the weight or despise the authority of the Sacred Volume. We rank it in our estimation far above the imaginations of the human understanding, whether as floating idle in the careless mind, or as embodied in creeds and articles and doctrinal liturgies of human device. Nor have any writers been more successful in vindicating revelation from the objections, and defending it against the assaults of infidels, than those of the Unitarian school : witness the venerable names of LARDNER and of PRIESTLEY ; not to mention many others of great and deserved though inferior celebrity.

Again, my reverend antagonist and myself have agreed to avail ourselves of all the aid that can be furnished to us by "*legitimate criticism*." Criticism is the art or science which teaches how an author's real meaning may be gathered from the expressions which he employs. The term, therefore, though harsh to the ears of many, as conveying the notion of too close an approach to the employment of human reason, denotes nothing but that which must be employed by any person who, in any way whatsoever, attempts to understand the Sacred Writings. "*Legitimate*" criticism is criticism of a fair and lawful kind : not rash, nor fanciful, nor arbitrary ; but based on sound principles, and conducted with caution and circumspection. Surely the man who refuses to investigate the meaning of the Word of God in this manner is unworthy of the treasures of grace and wisdom which it contains. We may safely pronounce that, unless it be by accident, he never will attain to them.

It will be in the recollection of such among you as paid attention to the newspaper correspondence which took place between Mr Bagot and myself, before preliminaries were finally agreed on, previous to the present

discussion, that, in one of his letters, he stated that the only standard on which he proposed to carry on the discussion is, "*the Authorised Version of the Scriptures, admitting the genuineness, authenticity, and divine authority of all and every part of the books; allowing, however, criticisms upon the phraseology, considered as a translation of a book compiled from the best manuscripts.*" And he made it a condition that I should publicly state, before any farther arrangements were made, "*whether any particular passages, and what, were excepted by me from the above description.*" You will recollect that I demurred to the first part of this proposition—*i. e.*, the admission of the genuineness, authenticity, and divine authority of all and *every part* of the books contained in the Authorised Version. I did so under an imperious sense of duty; and I am satisfied there is not a regularly educated clergyman of any sect or church in Christendom, who would not have refused to make the admission thus required of me. For common purposes the Authorised Version serves well enough. I am not acquainted with any version of the Scriptures, in any language, which does not contain enough of the divine spirit of the original to make the docile reader wise unto salvation; and for this reason, and because it is the translation to which our ears have been accustomed from childhood, and with which our religious impressions are most strongly associated, I am in the habit of using the Authorised Version in public, and generally, but not exclusively, in private. But to hold it up as a *critical* edition—to employ it in a discussion of this kind, where minute accuracy is above all desirable, as a standard of reference, either with respect to text or rendering—would be to employ it for a purpose for which it is ill adapted. I have given in one of my letters to Mr Bagot the opinions of two most eminent Trinitarian writers, who fully justify my reluctance to admit the infallible accuracy of King James's translators in the rendering

of every part of the original. I allude to Bishop LOWTH and Dr JOHN PYE SMITH ; the former an eminent critic and scholar, as is proved by his translation of Isaiah, with an instructive preface and learned notes ; and the latter, the author of the *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, in 3 vols. 8vo, unquestionably the most elaborate defence of the Proper Deity of the Word in the English language. The former, while he expresses his approbation—in which I entirely agree with him—of the style and phraseology of the Authorised Version, yet declares that, “in respect of the sense and accuracy of the interpretation, the improvements of which it admits are GREAT AND NUMBERLESS !” The latter, who, be it observed, is theological tutor in the Calvinistic College of Homer-ton, thus expresses himself, when writing of the errors and faults in the mode of arguing the present question with which the “orthodox” are especially chargeable:—

It would seem truly superfluous to express a caution against arguing from any translation of the Scripture as if it were the original. But it must be confessed, that not only unlearned Christians, but some men of respectable education, have fallen into this egregious error. Nor is this fault chargeable on the orthodox alone : their opponents are not perfectly clear from it. Respectable and excellent as our common version is, considering the time and circumstances in which it was made, no person will contend that it is incapable of important amendment. A temperate, impartial, and careful revision would be an invaluable benefit to the cause of Christianity ; and the very laudable exertions which are now made to circulate the Bible render such a revision at the present time a matter of still more pressing necessity.—Vol. I. p. 57, &c.

In perfect accordance with these sentiments, this distinguished writer, almost uniformly, gives his own translation of the passages upon which he comments. It would be easy to adduce a great variety of passages of similar import, from men of *undoubted orthodoxy*,—understanding that term in the common acceptation,—and even from persons who have signalised their zeal by writing in defence of the Proper Deity of the



Word. But I have not taken the trouble to transcribe any more of them, because it appears to me that those already given are sufficient to justify me in refusing to tie myself down to this particular translation of the Scriptures. How could I reasonably or conscientiously agree to argue on the basis of a version which, according to Bishop LOWTH, gives the sense and interpretation so imperfectly, that the improvements of which it admits in this respect are "GREAT AND NUMBERLESS!" How could I, with any degree of consistency, descend from the vantage-ground of truth and sound knowledge, to adopt the very error which the most illustrious champion of orthodoxy deploras in his brethren—not only the unlearned among them, but, as he asserts, in some persons of respectable education? Would not this be laying aside the panoply of divine truth to clothe myself in ill-tempered armour, which my opponents themselves are beginning to throw from them, as insufficient to defend them in the hour of danger?

But I had another reason for declining to receive the Authorised Version of the Scriptures as a full and sufficient guide. Not only is the translation in many places susceptible of great improvement, but the copy of the original, from which it was made, is known and is acknowledged by scholars of all sects and parties to have been in many places corrupted, mutilated, and interpolated, in a way which renders several of its statements, on this very subject, liable to strong suspicion, or entirely unworthy of notice. For the last one hundred and fifty years learned men, of the greatest industry, and of unquestionable integrity, have been laboriously engaged in endeavouring to detect these corruptions, wherever they could be found. Bishop WALTON, by his Polyglot Bible, containing the original of the Scriptures, with several of the most ancient versions, and a selection of various readings, may be said to have given the first impulse to this

most interesting and important branch of criticism. He was succeeded by MILL, who published an edition of the New Testament, with various readings from a great number of MSS. which he either collated himself, or procured to be collated, for the purpose of his edition. His work was republished in Holland, by KUSTER, with additions and corrections. WETSTEIN followed, who still farther enlarged the field by a prodigious number of various readings, collected from MSS. which were unknown to MILL and KUSTER, or only partially inspected. MATTHÆI, ADLER, and BIRCH, have lent material aid: the first by accurate collations of Greek MSS., contained in the public libraries of Russia, the second by a similar collation of the Vienna MSS.; the last by his ample details of the MS. treasures of the Vatican, and other libraries of Italy, which he travelled to inspect at the expense of the King of Denmark. Numerous important accessions have been made to the science by MICHÆLIS, and his annotator, Bishop MARSH, who, whatever may be thought of him in other respects, has honourably distinguished himself as a promoter of a liberal and enlightened criticism on the text and exegesis or explanation of the Sacred Volume. The results of all these labours and researches (labours and researches, be it observed, which have all taken place since the received translation was compiled, and of which, therefore, it was impossible for King James's translators to avail themselves, had they been, as doubtless they would have been, so disposed) are considered to be embodied in an edition of the Greek Testament by Professor GRIESBACH, which, on account of its accuracy, fidelity, and impartiality, has deservedly obtained a high rank in the estimation of theologians and scholars of all sects and parties. In particular, it is spoken of with great deference by Dr J. PYE SMITH; by Professor MOSES STUART, of Andover; and by Dr WARDLAW, of Glasgow: and I am sure that my reverend opponent will

agree with me, that men more distinguished for learning have not stepped forth of late years as champions of the Trinitarian doctrine. Indeed, so high is the reputation that this edition has acquired, that it is now tacitly assumed as the standard of reference among theological writers, insomuch that no person of character or standing among them would think it fair to build an argument on any of the readings which Professor GRIESBACH has rejected—at least without giving notice of that circumstance—and stating the ground of his dissent from the learned Professor's decision. Such is the edition of the New Testament writings, which I mean to assume as my standard of reference: but let it be observed that I do not seek, and never did seek, to tie down my reverend opponent to this or any other edition of the Sacred Volume. I may take this opportunity of mentioning that GRIESBACH was himself a conscientious believer in the Trinity. I do not appeal to his edition because it is the production of a partisan of my own, for such is not the fact, but simply because it is the most accurate I can find. If Mr Bagot agrees with him in the reading of any text, he is at liberty to follow him: if he dissents from the opinions of that critic, he is equally at liberty to do so. I do not mean to tie up his hands nor fetter his feet. I give him a clear stage and fair play; let him make the best of his cause. I should not have mentioned the name of GRIESBACH at all in these preliminaries, had not my reverend opponent pressed me to send him a list of texts, in which I thought the received English version of the Scriptures erroneous; in answer to this demand, I referred him to the work of the learned and orthodox critic as a standard by which I was and am willing to abide.

But my friends before me, and around me, may perhaps ask,—Why make this a point of importance? Why insist so strenuously on introducing this edition to your notice, when I admit the Common Version to

be sufficient for ordinary purposes? To this inquiry I answer, that Dr GRIESBACH has clearly and satisfactorily shown that several of those texts which are most confidently relied on as proofs of the "*Proper Deity of the Word*," are spurious interpolations, or false and corrupted readings. If I admitted these to be genuine, I should not only enter into this contest with my hands tied up, but—which I regard as a much more serious evil—I should indirectly lend my countenance and sanction to fraud and imposture; if, indeed, I could in that case be said to do so *only* indirectly.

That it was of importance to me to urge this point I am firmly convinced; and I am confirmed in this conviction when I look at the first page of that pamphlet of Mr Bagot, which gave rise to the present controversy. I find there—at the close of the very first paragraph, and the very first line which contains quotations of Scripture—reference to a certain text, which is usually called 1 JOHN v. 7, and which in the Common Version reads thus:—

There are three that bear record in heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

This passage is usually quoted as 1 JOHN v. 7; but, so far as authorship is concerned, *the father of lies* may dispute claim to it with the venerable Apostle, and must be allowed to have a preferable title; for, *if knowingly introduced*, a more gross, impudent, and baseless forgery was never executed or attempted. At first when I saw this passage in Mr Bagot's pamphlet, I was, I confess, struck with the ignorance of perhaps the most remarkable and clearly ascertained fact in the criticism of the sacred text which the quotation displayed. It afterwards, however, occurred to me, that the reference might have been introduced to justify his own employment of the term *Word*, in the statement of his doctrine, by the example of the person who forged this verse, whoever he might be. But this opinion I felt myself afterwards obliged to abandon, by two consider-

ations : The first is, that the authority of a convicted imposture could hardly be reckoned respectable ; and the second, that the very next reference is to a verse in which the term *Word* does not occur at all, and which in that point of view could lend him no aid. And I may here remark, that of three verses, which are all that Mr Bagot has adduced to justify the statement of his doctrine as the "*Proper Deity of the Word*," one is a manifest and acknowledged forgery ; another does not contain the term *Word* at all, but a different phrase, which he himself passes over as not sufficiently expressing the subject ; and the remaining one is to the only other place in the whole Bible where the phrase *Word* is employed, or can be alleged to be employed, to denote a person.

But 1 JOHN v. 7 is not the only one of the texts which are relied on by some as proofs of the Trinity, that are proved by Professor GRIESBACH to be spurious. I may refer, among others, to ACTS xx. 28, where the Common Version reads, in the address of the Apostle Paul to the elders at Ephesus—

Feed the church of *God*, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

Here there is an unquestionable reference to the death of Christ ; and in this allusion his blood is expressly called *the blood of God* ; a phraseology which, to say the least—though objectionable in other respects to Protestant ears—lends some countenance to Mr Bagot's doctrine of the "*Proper Deity of the Word*." But the learned and orthodox GRIESBACH, after a laborious examination of the original manuscripts and other authorities, leaves it almost beyond a doubt that this is a false reading ; and that the words really spoken by Paul, and recorded by Luke, were, "*Feed the church of the LORD, which he hath purchased with his own blood* ;" an expression which involves no doctrine but what Unitarians most gladly and gratefully receive.

There is another passage which is greatly relied on by the orthodox, and which this great critic, though himself of orthodox sentiments, felt himself compelled, by the weight of testimony and authority, to take out of the text. I allude to 1 TIM. iii. 16. There is no phrase which popular preachers and speakers are in general more fond of applying to our Lord and Saviour than *God manifest in the flesh*. This forms the beginning, middle, and end of every harangue on the subject of his alleged divinity, or—speaking under the correction of my reverend opponent—his “*proper Deity*.” One would think, by the frequency with which this phrase is repeated in their mouths, in conjunction with solemn appeals to the testimony of the Word of God, and cautions to form our doctrinal opinions according to its testimony, that this is the common and usual name by which our Saviour is designated in the Sacred Volume. We might suppose, from the language of popular preachers (what would be natural enough, I confess, if the doctrine in question were true) that, in all the accounts of all the Evangelists, and in all the Epistles of all the Apostles, our Saviour was customarily and usually designated by no other title. We might imagine that, in the account of his nativity, it was declared that the babe born in Bethlehem was *God manifest in the flesh*;—we might imagine that, when the doctors and teachers were surprised at the intelligence and answers of the child Jesus when twelve years old, it was declared that this child was no other than *God manifest in the flesh*;—we might conclude that, when at his baptism in Jordan a voice from heaven gave attestation to his divine mission, he was proclaimed, by the celestial herald, to be *God manifest in the flesh*;—and so through his miracles, and labours, and dangers, and sufferings, and resurrection, and ascension, we might expect to find the sacred historians everywhere reminding us, that they recorded the eventful history of *God manifest in the flesh*. But all such

expectations are vain—all such imaginations deceitful. Our blessed Lord is nowhere called *God manifest in the flesh*, except in 1 TIM. iii. 16 ; and there, as GRIESBACH informs us, he is so called only by those who are ignorant of the true reading, which is not that *God was manifest in the flesh*, but simply this,—

Great is the mystery of godliness : *he who* was manifest in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, was seen of angels, was preached unto the Gentiles, was believed on in the world, was received up into glory.

And well did a state of glory and bliss in the world above suit the character and conduct of the meek, the gentle, the benevolent JESUS OF NAZARETH—the Lamb of God, without blemish and without spot.

It is needless for me to enumerate, at present, any more of those texts which this learned and candid critic has shown to be spurious or corrupt. Suffice it to say, that some of those most confidently relied on, and most prominently put forward by orthodox advocates, are in his opinion interpolations ; and that learned and impartial men, on every side of the question, are, in general, fully satisfied of the accuracy of his decisions. If, however, any person is disposed to dissent from his conclusions, Professor GRIESBACH allows full opportunity to every reader of his books to form his own judgment, for he gives the evidence on both sides, against as well as in favour of his own conclusions.

This, then, is the standard to which I appeal : the Scriptures of the Old Testament, as they appear in the common text, interpreted by the aid of legitimate criticism ; and the Books of the New Testament, as they are found in that edition which is universally allowed to make the nearest approach to the original autographs, as prepared by the Evangelists and Apostles—an edition, I repeat again, not published by one whose opinions lay on my side of the question, but all whose feelings and views pointed the other way.



I now come to state the doctrine which I propose to maintain. I have, in compliance with the request of Mr Bagot, embodied the doctrine which I am about to maintain respecting the Supreme Being, and respecting the person of our blessed Lord, in answers to two queries propounded by him, and to which he insisted on a public and direct reply. The queries, as they were originally proposed (for to the second edition of them I do not wish unnecessarily to refer) were, *Whom do you consider to be the One God of the Bible? And what positive views do you hold in reference to the person of the Word which was made flesh?*

To these questions I gave my answers in the columns of the *Northern Whig* :—

1. There is one self-existent God, the Father : who is God alone ; to the entire exclusion of the alleged godhead of every other person, being, subsistence, or distinction.

2. The Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of God, deriving (even in his highest capacity, nature, or condition) his existence, wisdom, power, and authority, from the Father, and subordinate to him in all attributes.

I had purposely drawn up these propositions in a form which I thought directly impugned the doctrine advanced in the *Abstract* of Mr Bagot, and in the Articles of the Church of which he is a member ; but as at our conference soon afterwards, held for the purpose of settling the preliminaries, he thought the contradiction not strong enough, I afterwards modified them, at his desire, into the form in which they appear in the printed handbill :—

1. There is one self-existent God, the Father : who is God alone ; to the entire exclusion of the alleged Proper Deity of the Word.

2. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is (even in his highest capacity, nature, or condition) a created being, deriving his existence, wisdom, power, and authority, from the Father ; and inferior to him in these and all other attributes.

At the same time that I made these modifications in my printed propositions, I declared to him—and now

repeat publicly, for the information of all to whom the opinions of so humble an individual are matter of concern—that I am not one of those Christians who believe our blessed Lord and Saviour to be a simple, mere man, miraculously inspired and directed by the Supreme Being, or by his energy, the Holy Spirit. I receive his own words as literally true, when he declares that he came down from heaven. I acknowledge, according to his own most solemn declaration in that most affecting prayer that ever was uttered or recorded, that he had glory with the Father before the world was ; and I regard the state of glory into which he was removed by his ascension as only a resumption of that dignified state in which he existed before he appeared among men, with an augmentation of rank and felicity, conferred upon him as a reward for the benevolence, the patience, and the piety, evinced in the midst of the most cruel privations and sufferings here below. These are my views of the person of the Redeemer of men ; and I think they are borne out by the tenor of the Sacred Volume, though not unattended with difficult and perplexing circumstances, which sometimes occur to my own mind with a force that disposes me to look with great charity on those who differ from me. Still I think them to be founded on, and agreeable to, the Word of God. But I refused to insert them in my replies to Mr Bagot's queries, because they do not relate to the subject of controversy between him and me. Our discussion relates to the "*Proper Deity of the Word.*" On that subject my propositions are, I will venture to affirm, as full and explicit as he could himself desire ; and on points that may be agitated between myself and my Unitarian brethren, I will not enter into controversy with him. Let him first become a Unitarian, and then it will be time enough for him and me to discuss the pre-existence or humanity of Christ. And if I were to judge from the first of the propositions which he has put before the public, I might conclude that he has

already almost, and is on the highroad to become altogether, such as I am myself; for, behold, in the very front appears a statement which contains no doctrine from which the most determined Unitarian that ever lived would or could express his dissent. His first proposition is—

1. There is one God, Jehovah, who is God only, to the entire exclusion of the alleged godhead of every creature.

Shade of the injured EMLYN! be at rest. Your principles are espoused by the advocate of that Church whose prelates countenanced your odious persecution! Peace to your manes!—your mantle has fallen where you least expected it to light. “There is one God, Jehovah, who is God only, to the entire exclusion of the alleged godhead of every creature.” Where—where in all the world did Mr Bagot light upon this heterodox truth? Not, certainly, in the creeds which he habitually recites in public worship; and which, whether Nicene or Athanasian, contain no doctrine so pure, so clear, so beautiful, so scriptural, so divine, respecting the godhead of the Almighty! No, nor in the tomes of ponderous divinity that have been elaborately composed in cloisters, colleges, or halls—and have been preached in pulpits, or unfeignedly assented and consented to by the clergy of his Church. It was not there that Mr Bagot lighted upon the pure and beautiful truth, which his own first proposition enunciates, that *“there is one God, Jehovah, who is God only, to the entire exclusion of the alleged godhead of every creature!”* No: some stray leaf of LARDNER or of BELSHAM must have wandered into his study, like the Sibyl’s verses borne upon the flitting breeze; some fragment of PRIESTLEY or of PRICE, of CHANNING or of BRUCE, must have found its way into his retirement; and having caught his eye, has presented to his mind the idea of this simple and admirable truth, that JEHOVAH IS ONE! which, so soon as seen, captivated his imagination by

its loveliness, and won him by its charms to do it this public homage !

It cannot be said with truth that Mr Bagot adopted this divine and scriptural and most Unitarian proposition without due warning. The act was not done inadvertently. I told him, at the time when we exchanged our statements, that his amounted to a departure from his own doctrines. I told him that it would be considered by those of that theological party of which he was regarded as the champion, as a dereliction of their principles. I told him it would not be considered by any party as a satisfactory reply to his own question, which he had of his own mere motion put to me, and which he had insisted on my answering explicitly, and in the public prints, before he would even consent to make arrangements for the present meeting. I put the question to him in his own words,—“ *Whom do you consider to be the One God of the Bible?*” I fully expected to hear him answer, “ *God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost;*” or, in the language of the Litany, the “ *Holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three persons and one God.*” Such an answer would have comported with his office as a clergyman in a Trinitarian church, and with his character as a man zealous for that doctrine, and who had previously published a Treatise on the subject; but all such ideas were vain. Mr Bagot had, in his sermon at St Anne’s, avowed himself “ *a Unitarian;*” and so much was he in love with his newfangled designation, that nothing would content him but to advance this Unitarian proposition to the front of his arrayed battalion !—The name of Unitarian has been held up as a term of invective and severe reproach. Its synonymes, in popular addresses, have been infidel, atheist, reviler of the Saviour ! The Unitarian doctrine has been held up to public scorn and execration as a God-denying heresy—a soul destroying-leprosy—a delusion, and a upas-tree ! It is to be hoped that none of these epithets will ever again be employed :

for now our name is assumed, as a term of honour, by the very leader of our opponents ; and our right to its exclusive possession is contested with us as a thing of value ; and he who steps forward to impugn our faith in fact pays it the compliment of assuming it in name ; insomuch that when he might, and in my opinion was bound in fairness to put down in his first proposition a statement of the Trinitarian doctrine, he feels himself induced or obliged to content himself with the assertion of ours.

I say again—I distinctly say—that Mr Bagot, by this statement, shrinks from the defence of the Trinity. I say again, that he renders up the battlements of his own ecclesiastical creed. I say again, that he has not given a clear, an open, and explicit answer, in accordance with the principles which he is supposed to maintain, to the very question which he perseveringly and pertinaciously urged on me !

But while I allow—and not only allow, but in the course of this discussion shall strenuously maintain—that the *first* proposition of Mr Bagot contains nothing but a principle of eternal truth, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, I am very far from bestowing the same praise upon the *second*, which he has linked with it in an ungrateful and unholy alliance. His first proposition we have seen ; the second is to this effect :—

2. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator, is the Word made flesh, perfect God and perfect man ; possessing, as the Word, the same eternity, knowledge, power, authority, prerogatives, and godhead with the Father, and one with him in all attributes.

The match is ill-assorted ; the parties are not agreed ; and I forbid the banns !

The first proposition is rational, scriptural, intelligible ; the second is irrational, unscriptural, and unintelligible. The first proposition asserts that “ *there is one God, Jehovah, only ;* ” a proposition which is in accordance with the soundest dictates of the human understanding ; a proposition which is in complete

harmony with that primary revelation, the revelation of nature, on which the revelation of the Bible is founded: for if the heavens declare the glory of God, they declare the glory of One God only; if the firmament showeth forth his handiwork, it certainly reveals the handiwork of none besides. Whereas the second of these mutually-destructive propositions announces a second person in the character of Deity, of whom reason says nothing, and of whom, in this capacity, Scripture is silent. The first proposition declares that "*there is ONE GOD, JEHOVAH, who is God only, to the entire exclusion of the alleged godhead of every creature;*" a proposition which is distinctly stated over and over again, as I shall abundantly prove, in every part of the Sacred Volume, with every copious variety of phrase, of emphasis, and connection, that can give it weight. The latter announces, that "*the LORD JESUS CHRIST, the Mediator, is perfect God and perfect man;*" a statement which I defy him to produce any one passage of Scripture to prove—to prove, not by inference, nor deduction, nor wire-drawn conclusion, nor by arbitrary meaning placed upon words contrary to their known tenor and signification in other places—but by plain, downright, unequivocal assertion, such as I shall bring forward, if he does not, to establish his first proposition. Let him name to us one single text in which it is plainly declared that "*the Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator, is the Word made flesh, perfect God and perfect man;*"—or words to that effect,—and the controversy between us is at an end. The first proposition declares a truth which all can understand, and all can heartily embrace, that "*there is ONE GOD, JEHOVAH, who is God only;*" a truth which is no mystery and no contradiction. But the latter, which asserts that the same being is perfect God and perfect man, asserts what Mr Bagot may and will and must affirm to be a mystery, but which, I do declare, appears to me to be nothing but a contradiction and an

absurdity. To say that the same being and the same person is perfect God and perfect man, what is this but to affirm, that he is *almighty*, at the same time that he is *weak*—that he is *omniscient*, at the same time that he is *ignorant*—that he is *omnipresent*, at the same time that he is *limited in extent*—that he is *eternal*, at the same time that he is *limited in duration*—that he is *supreme and independent*, at the same time that he is *inferior and dependent*? Call this a mystery!—say that it is above human reason! It is not above human reason! I know the meaning of every term in the proposition. I know the force of every connecting particle or phrase employed. I see and know that the two sets of attributes, the divine and human, are perfectly incompatible; that the proposition which asserts they both belong to the *same person* is irreconcilable with itself, and is self-destructory. No such proposition is contained in Scripture!

I am aware that those who argue on this hypothesis tell us they are compelled to resort to it, in order to get rid of a contradiction. They say that one set of qualities appear to be ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ in one set of passages, and another in other places; and thus they are obliged to have recourse to the supposition of two natures as united in one person, in order to get rid of a contradiction! And how do they get rid of this contradiction? How does their theory help them out of the difficulty? Verily, it leaves them just where it found them! It gets rid of the contradiction by leaving it still staring them broadly in the face! Asserting the union of two natures, the divine and the human, in one person, is just asserting the same proposition in other words, which is allowed by the argument itself to be contradictory and absurd! I shall prove, when these supposed contradictory texts come before me in the discussion, that it is by no means necessary to have recourse to this extravagant and unheard-of supposition, in order to understand the passages referred to.



I shall show, if I have time, that there is not one of them which may not be explained on the supposition that our blessed Lord is what he always spoke of himself as being, one separate and distinct person and being, like other created intelligences. In the mean time, I would just beg to state or to repeat to you, what is the nature and kind of that evidence which, if this doctrine be the doctrine of Scripture, must be required to support it.

For this purpose, let us place ourselves in the situation of one of the Evangelists—MATTHEW, for instance, who had known, and personally accompanied our Lord. He knew that this illustrious teacher was not only the long-expected Messiah, for whom the nation of the Jews anxiously looked, but a personage infinitely more exalted than the race of Abraham had ever exalted in their most ardent moods of anticipation ; he was no less than THE ETERNAL AND OMNIPOTENT JEHOVAH, who created, sustains, and governs the wide universe of nature, clothed with the attributes of humanity. Under the veil of human infirmity was concealed the awful majesty of the Eternal King ! With this sublime and mysterious being MATTHEW had himself lived in habits of intimacy and familiarity. He had been invited to become his follower, and had accepted the call ; he had entertained him in his house—had accompanied him on his journeys through the land of Judea—had witnessed his dangers, and shared his privations ; and had seen him weep over the grave of Lazarus ; and had heard him affectingly deplore the blindness and infatuation of the Jews in obstinately rejecting him ; and had beheld him shed tears over the city of Jerusalem, while he foretold the ruin and desolation which the perverseness of its inhabitants was bringing down upon it. Nay, more, he had beheld him seized like a malefactor by a band of infuriate zealots ; dragged before a bigoted high-priest and a cruel magistrate ; condemned to death by a sentence extorted by threats from an unwilling but guilty judge ; and, at last, crucified on Golgotha, with

every circumstance of insult and aggravated cruelty : and knowing all this, and knowing that this being thus treated was no less a being than THE DREAD AND AWFUL MAJESTY OF HEAVEN,—that Great and Eternal Being, whose very name was deemed by the Jews too sacred ever to be pronounced, save once in each year, by the high-priest when alone, in the holy of holies ; — MATTHEW, knowing all this, sits down to write a history of his life and labours for the instruction of his countrymen. He begins with the commencement of his earthly existence ; he continues his narrative through the intermediate stages of his life and ministry ; he ends with his resurrection from the tomb. He seems to have taken particular pains to make his narrative as full and minute as possible ; yet, wondrous to relate, *the one circumstance*, which, if true, formed the most astonishing and wonderful of all the wonders connected with our Saviour's character—*the miracle of miracles*, which, if true, eclipsed all other miracles that ever were wrought—*the doctrine of doctrines*, which, if true, threw all other facts and doctrines completely into the shade—*the transcendent fact*, at which, as a modern believer in its reality has declared, “reason stands aghast, and faith itself is half confounded,”—THIS TREMENDOUS DOCTRINE, which, had it been true, and had it been known to the Apostle MATTHEW, would have engrossed all his thoughts, concentrated all his feelings in itself and its own mysterious awfulness, and put all his faculties into requisition, in order to express, in a worthy manner, the overwhelming truth—this all-engrossing, all-concentrating, and all-mysterious fact, is passed over by MATTHEW, without being once mentioned by him in his history ! He had lived in habits of intimacy and familiarity with Almighty God. He writes for the instruction of his countrymen the history of his incarnation, and, strange to say, not one word does the historian drop, as from himself, on the subject of the real nature of that being whose history he records. Read over the Gospel of

MATTHEW from beginning to end ; you will find many facts recorded which are, to say the least, very hard to reconcile with the hypothesis of the "*Proper Deity of the Word*." But of the "*Proper Deity of the Word*" itself the historian says not a single syllable ; nay, the term *Word*—which we are now told is the accurate and descriptive phrase to denote the divine Being who thus lived, laboured, and died among men—is not found in this sense in the whole Gospel of MATTHEW. And the only two passages in the book, which are supposed to have any reference to the doctrine, are the name "EMMANUEL," applied to Christ in the same sense as it was given to a child born in the lifetime of Isaiah, not by the historian, but by an angel ; and a clause in the baptismal commission, which no more proves the "*Proper Deity of Christ*," than a precisely similar phrase in the Epistles of St PAUL proves that Moses had also a Supreme and Proper Deity of his own. I have looked into the writings of several Trinitarian divines and expositors, both before the present discussion was talked of and since, and I have not found that any other passage in the Gospel of MATTHEW is supposed to contain anything like a direct assertion of the "*Proper Deity of Christ*." We have seen that neither of these assertions, or supposed assertions, is direct ; and neither of them is given in the words of the historian himself. How are we to account for this wonderful silence of the holy Apostle ? Are we to suppose with ATHANASIUS—that renowned champion of orthodoxy—that the venerable Evangelist wilfully concealed the truth, lest it might offend the prejudices of his countrymen, as well as of the Gentiles ? If so, we give to his discretion what we take from his veracity and historical credit.

But our astonishment is increased when we find that MARK—who made MATTHEW's Gospel the foundation of an independent narrative—observes an equal silence ; that LUKE, who evidently had the works of his predecessors before his eye when composing his narrative, is

equally reserved ; and that JOHN only mentions, or is supposed to mention, the doctrine in his own words in one passage of his Gospel—the commencement of it—to which Mr Bagot's second proposition obviously refers, and to which I shall probably address myself in some remark before this discussion closes.

Now, my Christian friends and brethren, I ask you, is this probable ? Is this the way you would have conveyed a knowledge of this unspeakably important and interesting truth had you been in the situation of the Evangelists ? Put yourselves for a moment in the place of these illustrious disciples. Assume to yourselves the feelings of warm, affectionate, and grateful attachment to your Saviour, with which his personal friends must have been animated. Add to their veneration for his character, and their respect for his authority, and their regret for his sorrows, their exultation and transport at witnessing his resurrection and ascension. Add to all these the sentiments which they must have cherished for their Lord and Master, if they knew the statement in Mr Bagot's proposition to be true. Suppose all these feelings yours ; and that, with all these feelings strong upon you, you sat down to write his history. Would you, I ask, would you have passed over this wonderful and awful event as they have done ? I fearlessly pronounce that you would not, and could not have done so. It is not in human nature. The doctrine, therefore, unless it be supported by testimonies far more numerous in quantity and far more explicit in kind than those usually adduced out of the evangelical records, cannot be true. If it had been true, it would not have been left to be gathered, or inferred, or collected from hints, inuendoes, allusions—from minute criticism and the doctrine of the Greek article. If it had been true, it would have shone forth in every page ; it would have adorned every paragraph ; it would have illuminated every line. But so far is this from being the case, that I am willing to rest the whole cause on an examin-

ation of any one of the Evangelists. Let us begin with the beginning—go through every passage from the commencement to the close ; let us consider *seriatim* the different statements made respecting our Saviour in the order in which they occur, and it will then be speedily seen on which side the weight of scriptural testimony lies. I venture to affirm, that Mr Bagot will not have adduced three hints or allusions to the doctrine of the Supreme Deity and Perfect Manhood of Christ, as united in one person, until I shall have quoted three hundred direct proofs to the contrary. On such a regular and orderly examination of any one Evangelist throughout, I am willing to rest the cause.

The arguments which it will be my duty to bring forward will be very different from those which have hitherto been adduced on the other side. In place of the hints, allusions, and forged texts, which are so often paraded as proofs of the Trinity, I will bring forward a class of texts, plain, direct, and unimpeachable, directly affirming the doctrine which I defend, and from which I take my designation as a Unitarian—namely, the Divine Unity ; affirming it not with exception and reservation of a threefold distinction of persons, subsistences, or hypostases, but plainly, directly, absolutely, and unreservedly. And I shall, for this purpose, quote such texts as—

DEUT. vi. 4. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is One LORD [*i. e.*, JEHOVAH our God is One JEHOVAH.]

ISA. xxxvii. 16. O LORD of hosts, God of Israel, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth. 20. Now therefore, O Lord our God, save us from his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou art the LORD, even thou only.

ZECH. xiv. 9. JEHOVAH shall be king over all the earth. In that day there shall be ONE JEHOVAH, and his name ONE.

NEHEM. ix. 6. Thou, even thou, art JEHOVAH alone : thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host ; . . . and thou preservest them all.

MARK xii. 29. Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE

LORD! 30. And thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment. . . . 32. And the scribe (with whom he had been conversing) said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for THERE IS ONE GOD, *and there is none other but He*. . . . 34. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said, *Thou art not far from the kingdom of God!*

GAL. iii. 20. GOD IS ONE!

I shall next bring forward plain, downright, and intelligible assertions, that the "FATHER" alone is the one Being, who is asserted to be God alone, to the entire exclusion of all others. I challenge Mr Bagot to bring forward any similar declarations respecting *God the Son*, or *God the Word*, if the phrase pleases him better; to say nothing of God the Holy Ghost, whom, indeed, it is quite customary to pass over in silence in the present argument: why this is the case I do not know; for if he be God as much as either of the other two, he has surely as good a right to be put prominently forward as they. Under this division of my subject I shall adduce such authorities as—

MATT. xxiii. 9. One is your Father who is in heaven.

1 COR. viii. 4-6. . . . There is none other God but One: for though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many and lords many), yet to us *there is but One God*, THE FATHER, of whom are all things, and we in him, &c.

EPH. iv. 6. There is ONE GOD AND FATHER OF ALL, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

MATT. x. 29. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And one of them shall not fall on the ground *without* YOUR FATHER!

LUKE x. 21. In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O FATHER, LORD OF HEAVEN AND EARTH. . . . Even so, FATHER, &c.—See MATT. xi. 25.

I shall then advert to a number of passages in which our Lord Jesus Christ is expressly distinguished from the one God in such a manner as to prove that his alleged Deity is entirely excluded by those passages which assert

the sole supremacy of the Father. With this view I shall refer to such texts as—

MARK x. 18. Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *There is none good but one; that is, GOD!*

1 TIM. ii. 5. There is *One God*, and *One Mediator* between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.

JOHN xvii. 3. This is life eternal, that they may know **THEE**, **THE ONLY TRUE GOD**, and *Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.*

MARK xiii. 32. Of that day, and that hour, knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son, —BUT THE FATHER.*

MATT. xii. 50. Whosoever shall do the will of *my Father* who is in heaven, the same is my brother, &c.

I shall then advert to the passages which contain the doctrine of the New Testament respecting religious worship, which show that, according to the example and precepts of Christ, and the practice of his disciples, the Father is the only being to whom it can be presented; and, accordingly, that he is the only true God, to whom all homage and veneration are due. The passages which I shall adduce under this head are such as the following :—

MATT. vi. 6. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet; and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to **THY FATHER** who is in secret; and **THY FATHER**, who seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.

MATT. vi. 9. After this manner therefore pray ye: **OUR FATHER** who art in heaven, &c.

MATT. xviii. 19. Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall *ask*, it shall be done for them of **MY FATHER** who is in heaven.

LUKE x. 21. At that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O **FATHER**, *Lord of heaven and earth*, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes; even so, **FATHER**, for so it seemed good in thy sight.

This verse not only marks a plain line of distinction between our Saviour and the Father, but proves that our Lord addressed his prayers only to the Father; which is confirmed, among other texts, by—

MATT. xxvi. 39. And he went a little farther, and fell on



his face, and prayed, saying, O MY FATHER, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me : nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt !

After bringing forward these proofs in support—I might say in *demonstration*—of the doctrine contained in my first proposition, I shall advert, in support of my second, to the *names, titles, and designations*, commonly bestowed upon our Lord Jesus Christ in Scripture ; and I shall be able to prove that these are *all* such as we know, either from their own nature, or from the express assertions of the sacred writers, to be expressive of inferiority. Of these I may now enumerate the terms “*Word*,”—“*Son of God*,”—“*Child of God*,”—“*the Son*,”—“*the Son of Man*,”—“*Man*,”—“*Christ*,”—“*Prophet*,”—“*Apostle*,”—“*the Sent*,”—“*the Mediator*,”—“*the Anointed*.”

I shall next bring forward a numerous array of passages, in which it is expressly declared that Christ was created by the Father, and that he received from him existence, wisdom, power, authority, and dignity ; that he is in all things subordinate and inferior to the Father, and expressly disclaimed a participation of the divine attributes in that unlimited sense in which they belong to God. Now, you will observe, that for all these things I shall adduce, not hints, or innuendoes, or inferences, but plain, direct, and explicit assertions : and I challenge Mr Bagot to bring forward, either any assertions of the same kind, respecting God, the Father, or any assertions, equally plain and palpable, respecting the dignity which he assigns to our Lord Jesus Christ. On the contrary, I shall prove before you, by quotations of Scripture, that those expressions which are commonly brought forward as proofs on this side are freely ascribed to other persons whose supreme deity nobody dreams of asserting ; and that, when the sacred writers celebrate, in the highest strains, the glory and dignity of the Saviour, they do, at the same time, couple with their praises expressions which plainly intimate that, what-



ever Christ is, how high soever his titles, and how exalted so ever his rank, he is, and has all, of and from the Father; and whatever the respect and honour which is his due, it is to redound ultimately to the glory of the Father. Now, this is exactly the pure Unitarian doctrine; and if I prove these things I prove my point.

---

MR BAGOT.—I shall not occupy either your time or my own with a long introduction. I appear before you this day in consequence of what I consider a challenge from Mr Porter to discuss with him one of the most important doctrines of Christianity—the True Deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

I enter upon this solemn undertaking with the most perfect persuasion that the progress of the glorious Gospel of the ever-blessed God cannot be impeded, however it might be the Lord's pleasure, in some way, to advance it, by the result of this controversy. He to whom the shields of the earth belong has infinite resources at command, and can easily overrule every circumstance to the promotion of his glory. Whatever may be the sentiments of individuals as to the propriety of such a discussion, I must take the liberty to insist that, when the challenge had once appeared, I had but one course to follow—namely, to accept it; and I trust that, in so doing, I have been solely influenced by a sense of duty. There are, I am aware, two classes of persons in this assembly. To those who agree with me in sentiment I would earnestly say, Let me have your fervent prayers, that he who was with Paul when no man stood beside him—who said to him in the hour of trial, "My grace is sufficient for thee; my strength is perfected in weakness;" and who promised to his Apostles a mouth and a wisdom which none of their adversaries could gainsay or resist—would grant me a spirit of humility, energy, and judgment, and enable me to

speak the truth in love, so as to glorify his holy name. And to those who differ from me I would affectionately say, I do not come here as your enemy, but as your friend. I am influenced, I trust, neither by bigotry, prejudice, nor sectarian animosity, but simply by a desire to proclaim and enforce what I consider to be the very essence and vitality of the Christian religion. I would earnestly disclaim the entertainment of any personal antipathy towards those who differ from me in religious opinion; and am at all times ready to concede to others that full credit for disinterested sincerity which I claim for myself; though I should be sorry to compromise for one moment the importance which I believe the Word of God attaches to the sentiments I hold, by not plainly declaring my impression that those who reject them are in a state of dangerous error. I do, then, expect that we shall both be heard with candour and indulgence by those who differ from our respective views; and I shall be much disappointed if this discussion will not excite a greater spirit of religious inquiry, and a greater disposition to search the Scriptures with studious and prayerful investigation, and circulate a greater feeling of courtesy and social kindness amongst persons of opposite religious opinions, than, I am sorry to say, has hitherto prevailed.

I shall proceed, without any further introduction, to demonstrate the truth of the propositions I have proposed to defend, according to Scripture.

My FIRST proposition asserts, that there is but one God, Jehovah, who is God only, to the entire exclusion of the alleged godhead of every creature. For this I advance the following proofs:—

DEUT. vi. 4. Hear, O Israel! the Lord our God is one Lord.

JOHN xvii. 3. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

1 COR. viii. 4-6. As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one: for though there be that are called gods, whether in

heaven or earth (as there be gods many and lords many), but to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.

EPH. iv. 6. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

To these I might add many more passages; but these are amply sufficient to prove, that there is but One God, to the entire exclusion of the alleged godhead of every real or fictitious creature. I would here request every one to draw a clear distinction between *the exclusion of all independent beings from the Godhead*, and *the inclusion of three Divine Persons in that One Godhead*. Whilst I not only admit, but maintain, that the texts above quoted, and others of a similar form, are quite satisfactory in proving the *exclusion* of every created being from Deity, I maintain that they do not contradict the doctrine which teaches the *inclusion* of Three Persons in the One Deity of the Bible. This leads me to state and prove my SECOND proposition, viz. :—

The Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator, is the Word made flesh, perfect God and perfect man; possessing, as the Word, the same eternity, knowledge, power, authority, prerogatives, and Godhead with the Father, and one with him in all attributes.

This proposition refers to the Lord Jesus Christ in three points of view: as being the Mediator; as being perfect man; and as being perfect God, one God with the Father.

1. That he is Mediator is asserted in the following, amongst other passages :—

1 TIM. ii. 5. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.

HEB. viii. 6. By how much also he is the Mediator of a better covenant.

HEB. ix. 15. For this cause he is the Mediator of the new testament.

I would here remark, that a mediator is one who assumes the office of interposition between two parties who are at variance, in order to effect a reconciliation. This definition will not, at least in a general point of view, be questioned. What I wish principally to remark, in reference to it, is, that a mediator must necessarily be, as long as he sustains the office, subordinate to one of the parties : therefore the Lord Jesus Christ, as Mediator, is, in *that* capacity, *subordinate* to God the Father ; and, consequently, wherever he is spoken of in Scripture in that capacity, we naturally expect to find clear evidences of his subordination ; and as the New Testament professes to be a history of his mediatorial work, we naturally find it full of evidences of his mediatorial subordination. Upon this principle, therefore, it is quite natural to find the Mediator asserting that his doctrine is not his own, but his that sent him (JOHN vii. 16) ; that the Father had sanctified him, and sent him into the world (JOHN x. 36) ; that he came to do his Father's will (JOHN v. 30) ; that, during the period of his continuing on earth, as Mediator, his "Father was greater than he" (JOHN xiv. 28) ; and that, as his mediatorial kingdom had a *beginning*, so, when the purposes for which it was instituted shall be accomplished, it shall have a *termination*, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father (1 COR. xv. 24 to 28).

2. The proposition asserts that the Lord Jesus Christ is perfect man ; by which I mean that he possessed a true human soul and body. Of this I submit the following proofs :—

(1.) He is called a man in several passages of Scripture, and without any qualifying expression which would lead us to attach to the word any other than the ordinary signification ; as in ACTS ii. 22, "A man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him ;" and 1 TIM. ii. 5,

“There is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.”

(2.) He displayed, during his continuance on earth, every characteristic of a complete, but sinless humanity.

(3.) His mind, as man, possessed the same characteristics as a proper human mind should possess. It was capable of acquiring knowledge progressively, as his human body was only capable of increasing in stature progressively (LUKE ii. 52); and after all its acquisitions, it was capable only of a limited knowledge; for there were some things which the man Christ Jesus was ignorant of (as of the hour of judgment, MARK xiii. 32). *An omniscient human mind is a contradiction in terms.*

But on the subject of our Saviour's humanity, it will be sufficient to refer to two comprehensive passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews; the former in HEB. ii. 14, “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.” The latter is in HEB. ii. 17, 18, “Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God.” From these passages it appears that Christ's human nature was assumed, in order that he might become capable of dying, so as thereby to effect our deliverance; and also in order that, by a *personal* experience in our infirmities, he might feel such a sympathy with us, as would give us a confidence in his faithfulness and mercy. And when we consider how much of our sinfulness and misery results from our *ignorance*, it is manifest that, in order to lay the foundation for a perfect sympathy, he must have assumed the ignorance of human nature. He was, in fact, “in all

points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," HEB. iv. 15.

I would here remark that in his human nature the Lord Jesus Christ was dependent upon, and inferior to, Deity. Hence, as the four Gospels profess to be a history of the "days of his flesh," we naturally find them containing copious proofs of this dependence and inferiority. But such proofs have nothing to do with the distinct and independent question of his Deity.

3. The proposition asserts that the Lord Jesus Christ is perfect God ; possessing the same eternity, knowledge, power, authority, prerogatives, and godhead with the Father, and one with him in all attributes.

I shall simply rest this doctrine upon the testimony of our mutually acknowledged standard, the Word of God. And, as the Bible professes to be a revelation of *facts*, and not of the explanations of facts or of mysteries, I shall, throughout the entire discussion, consider this doctrine entirely as a question of *fact*, to be affirmed or denied by testimony, and shall not enter into any metaphysical disquisitions which would involve any inquiry into its possibility.

The simple argument by which it appears to me that this doctrine is to be proved may be thus stated :—

The only way by which we can ascertain the God of the Bible is, by allowing our minds to be guided by that revelation of the peculiar attributes and prerogatives of Deity, which the Bible presents, so as to admit and recognise the Deity of whatever person these attributes and prerogatives of Deity are associated with. Now upon this principle, if I found that the attributes and prerogatives of Deity were ascribed to a person, whom, at the same time, I found to be designated by the name of ISAIAH or PETER, I would, of course, argue for the Deity of ISAIAH or PETER, and maintain that they were manifestations of the godhead in human nature. But this I do not find to be the case. I find, however,

that the peculiar attributes and prerogatives of true and perfect godhead are in Scripture associated with him who is, at the same time, designated the Lord Jesus Christ; that he is represented to our view as possessing the same characteristics and divine privileges with the Father (whose Deity I here *assume*). And, therefore, whilst I fully maintain that there is but one God, I at the same time submit to the force of all these scriptural proofs, by maintaining that the Lord Jesus Christ is, in a sense distinct from, but consistent with, his assumed condition as Man and Mediator, *One God with the Father*.

This is a statement of the general argument, the logical validity of which will not be questioned, because it is based upon the same principles by which our opponents prove the Deity of the Father. I shall now proceed to adduce, in detail, the scriptural proofs by which I substantiate this general argument.

I. I SHALL BRING FORWARD PROOFS OF THE NAMES, ATTRIBUTES, AND PREROGATIVES OF DEITY BEING ASCRIBED TO CHRIST, *viz.* :—

In ISAIAH vii. 14, we read the following passage : “Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel ;” which is asserted by MATTHEW to be a prophecy of the nativity of Christ, containing a *descriptive designation of his person* ; “Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his name *Emmanuel* ; which, being interpreted, is *God with us*,” MATT. i. 23.

In ISA. ix. 6, 7, the prophet, having spoken of Christ in reference to his human nature as “the child born,” immediately describes him in contrast to this, as the “*mighty God*,” or “strong God,” and as invested with *everlasting dominion* : “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given : and the government shall be upon his shoulder : and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, *The mighty God*, the everlasting



Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be *no end*, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth *even for ever*. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will accomplish this." The reference of this prophecy to Christ is evident : 1st, from its connection with ISA. vii. 14, of which the application to him is confirmed by MATTHEW ; 2dly, from the application of the 1st and 2d verses to Christ, in MATT. iv. 14 to 16 ; and from the virtual application of the passage itself to him, in LUKE i. 32 and 33 ; and, 3dly, from the fact that the description of person and character contained in this prophecy will not comport with any other person.

In JEREMIAH xxiii. 5 and 6, *the personal glory* and mediatorial value of Christ are described by the complex title of "Jehovah our righteousness." "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely : and this is his name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord our righteousness*."

In MIC. v. 2, the prophet, having foretold Christ's coming forth from Bethlehem, immediately adduces, in contrast with this, a description which asserts his *strict eternity* : "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel ; *whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting*." The application of this passage to Christ is proved by reference to MATT. ii. 16, and JOHN vii. 42.

In MAL. iii. 1, the prophet speaks of Christ by a distinct reference to his Deity and to his mediatorial office : "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before *me* ; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to *his temple*, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in : behold, *he*

shall come, saith the Lord of hosts." The application of this passage to Christ is clearly asserted in MARK i. 2. And as it describes the temple in Jerusalem as being "*his temple*," it is evident that he was the God of the temple, or else it was consecrated to idolatry.

In LUKE i. 17, we find Christ designated as the "Lord the God of Israel." "And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the *Lord their God*, and he shall go before *him* in the spirit and power of Elias," &c. That Christ is here intended there can be no question, especially when we read the words of the Baptist in JOHN iii. 28, "I am not the *Christ*, but I am sent before *him*."

In JOHN i. 1, Christ's Deity is expressly asserted, under the designation of the Word: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and *the Word was God*."

In JOHN i. 3, the Apostle shows that he understands Christ, as the Word, to be God in the strict and true sense, by ascribing to him, both positively and negatively, the creation of all things: "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made."

Also, in verse 10, he ascribes to him the creation of the world *in which* he was: "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not."

In JOHN iii. 13, we learn that Christ was in heaven (which he could only be in his divine nature), whilst he was in his human nature conversing with Nicodemus: "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven."

Christ permitted his disciples to ascribe to him the faculty of omniscience, without rejecting it, in JOHN xvi. 30, "Now are we sure that thou knowest all things," &c.; and in JOHN xxi. 17, "Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee."

In JOHN xx. 28, two titles of Deity are ascribed to the Saviour, with his full approbation: "And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God."

In ROM. ix. 5, we read, "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." In this passage there are four distinct attributes of true Deity referred to Christ, in respect of that nature of his which is not "according to the flesh:" viz., the title "God;" the attributes of supremacy and eternity; and the title "blessed," which, *of itself*, without any adjunct, implies true Deity, as is evident from MARK xiv. 61, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?"

PHIL. ii. 5-8: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him," &c. In this passage Christ is spoken of in three respects: 1st, as to his pre-existent state, in the form of God; 2dly, as to his humiliation in the flesh; and 3dly, as to his subsequent mediatorial exaltation by the Father. The first view is that upon which I rest the argument for his Deity.

The *independent* and *unlimited* power of Christ is asserted in PHIL. iii. 21, "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working (or energy) whereby *he is able* even to subdue *all* things *unto himself*."

The priority of Christ to *all* created things, and the creation and preservation of all things by him, is asserted in COL. i. 15-17, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: *for* by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones,

or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." This last clause, also, necessarily implies his possession of an existence co-extended with his works.

The Deity of Christ is asserted in COL. ii. 9, "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

In 1 TIM. iii. 16, we have a proof that he who was manifest in the flesh was God: whether we read the passage as it stands in our English translation, and as GRIESBACH sanctioned in his first edition, "And, without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh," &c.; or thus, according to GRIESBACH's second edition, "But, if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God (which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth; and without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness) who was manifest in the flesh," &c.; for in this case, the last masculine antecedent, which could agree with the relative "who," is "God."

In TITUS ii. 13, we read, "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." As the glorious appearing here spoken of refers to Christ's coming to judgment, the application of the title "great God" to him is apparent.

In HEB. i. 2, Christ is spoken of as the Heir and Creator of all things: "Whom he (*i.e.*, the Father) hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds."

In HEB. i. 3, we read, "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power," &c. In these words two remarkable epithets are given to Christ, which imply his perfect oneness in glory and subsistence with the Father; and also the work of Providence is expressly referred to him.

In HEB. i. 6, he is represented as the proper object of worship to the angels: "When he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him."

In HEB. i. 8, the Father is represented as addressing the Son in language which necessarily implies his possession of Deity and of everlasting dominion: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." &c. These words, being a quotation from the 45th PSALM, show that we are to understand the description of Deity which that Psalm contains as relating to Christ.

In HEB. i. 10, the Father is represented as addressing to the Son a quotation from the 102d PSALM: "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish; but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou *art the same*, and thy years shall not fail." In this passage, Christ is addressed as the Creator, the beginning and the end of all things, and as invested with the *eternity* and *immutability* of Deity.

N.B.—The first chapter of HEBREWS, from which the last five proofs have been extracted, also contains passages of an independent nature, in which the mediatorial character and subordination of the Son are mentioned, in contrast with these ascriptions of the peculiarities of Deity.

In HEBREWS xiii. 8, immutability is ascribed to Christ by the same Greek expression (*ὁ αὐτός*) as in chap. i. 12, and with an addition similar to that which is connected with that term in the latter passage: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever;"—a declaration parallel to, but more emphatic than the other, "Thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail."

In 1 JOHN v. 20, Christ is styled the true God, as is evident not merely from the grammatical construction

of the passage, but also from the connection of that title with the title of "eternal life," which is used as a designation of Christ, as distinguished from the Father, in the 2d verse of the 1st chapter of this Epistle: "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is *the true God*, and eternal life."

In REV. i. 8, we read, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Upon this passage we remark, that although we believe it to be the language of Christ, yet our argument is as strong, if not stronger, by submitting to the interpretation which refers it to God the Father; for, according to this view, the passage characterises the Father by the very same divine titles which are assumed by Christ in the 17th and 18th verses of the same chapter; and consistency requires that we should not give a different interpretation to the very same terms in the two cases.

In REV. i. 17, the title of First and Last is assumed by Christ, "Fear not, I am the first and the last;" also in chap. ii. 8, "These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive;" and in REV. xxii. 13, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last."

In REV. xvii. 14, two titles of Deity are ascribed to Christ: "These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings;" and also in chap. xix. 16, "And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords."

In the following passages the title "God" is applied to Christ: EPHES. v. 5, "In the kingdom of Christ and of God," which, according to the Greek, might be more distinctly rendered, "In the kingdom of him who is Christ and God." 2 THESS. i. 12, "According to the

grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ," or "of our God and Lord Jesus Christ." 2 PET. i. 1, "Through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," or "of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ."

In 1 John iii. 2 and 5, Christ is spoken of under the title of "God :—" "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be : but we know that, when *he* shall appear, we shall be like him ; for we shall see him as he is." "And ye know that *he* was manifested to take away our sins." It is evident that the person designated in these two verses by the pronoun "*he*" is the Lord Jesus Christ ; but, *grammatically speaking*, this pronoun must refer to the word "God" in the second verse ; therefore Christ is here styled God.

We advance the following proofs of Christ's having received and recognised, whilst upon earth, many acts of homage and petition, which, if he were a *merely* created being, he should have rejected upon a principle of piety, and because such honours were of too high a nature to be paid to any but one invested with true and proper Deity : MATT. viii. 2, "There came a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, *if thou wilt*, thou canst make me clean." MARK describes the circumstance thus, chap. i. 40, "There came a leper to him, beseeching him, and kneeling down to him ;" and LUKE v. 12, "fell on his face, and besought him, saying," &c. The answer of our Saviour completely recognised, and therefore justified as correct, the ascription of personal ability which the entreaty contained, "*I will* : be thou clean." MATT. ix. 18, "There came a certain ruler, and *worshipped* him." LUKE expresses it, chap. viii. 41, "He fell down at Jesus' feet." MATTH. xiv. 33, "They that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, "Of a truth thou art the Son of God." MATTH. xv. 25, "Then came she and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me." MARK says, chap. vii. 25, "She fell at his feet." Upon these instances we remark, that they are as express and



positive acts of devotion, as that which Peter is described as refusing from Cornelius, in ACTS x. 25, "As Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man:" and that—as the apostle Paul defines idolatry, in ROM. i. 25, to consist in "worshipping and serving the creature *besides* the Creator" (for so *παρά*, in the Greek, should be translated)—our Saviour would have displayed an equal concern for maintaining the exclusive prerogatives of God, if God had been an infinitely superior being to him, to whom he was indebted for existence, and whom he ought therefore to have worshipped himself.

In the 45th PSALM, the application of which to Christ is proved in the first chapter of the Epistle to the HEBREWS, we read this command in the 11th verse, addressed to the Church, "He is thy Lord, and worship thou him."

In LUKE xxiv. 51, 52, the Apostles are described as having worshipped him immediately after his ascension: "And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven. *And they worshipped him*, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy."

In ACTS i. 24, the Apostles are represented as thus praying to him, and at the same time ascribing to him a knowledge peculiar to Deity: "And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen." It is evident that the Lord here addressed was the Lord Jesus, as he had originally chosen the twelve Apostles, as they were to be *his* Apostles, and as the election of a successor to Judas properly belonged to Christ's mediatorial office, as "head over *all* things to his Church."

In ACTS xiv. 23, we read, "And when they had prayed (or, praying to) with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." The Lord on whom they believed was manifestly Christ.

In ACTS vii. 59, 60, we read, "And they stoned Stephen, invoking and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." Here the dying martyr is represented, in the most solemn manner, as addressing to Christ two prayers, the very same as those which the Saviour, "in the days of his flesh," offered up to his Father on the cross, and also as ascribing to Christ the *very same divine powers and prerogatives* as Christ ascribed to his Father; and, at the same time, we are told that Stephen was full of the Holy Ghost, and therefore incapable of an act of idolatry.

In 2 COR. xii. 8, 9, we read, "For this cause I besought the Lord thrice, that it (the thorn in the flesh) might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness." The Lord to whom the Apostle prayed is then said to be Christ: "Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power (or strength) of Christ may rest upon me." Now here we have an instance of repeated prayer to the Saviour by an apostle who has elsewhere said, "In every thing by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God," PHIL. iv. 6.

In REV. iv. 17, we read this command, "Worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters;" which is equivalent to an express and direct command to worship Christ; for "by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth," COL. i. 16.

So frequent was the practice of praying to Christ in the Apostolic Church, that its members were characterised and known by a title derived from the custom; as in the language of Ananias, in ACTS ix. 14, "And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name;" and of Paul, in 1 COR. i. 2, "And unto all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord."

In REV. v. 14, Christ is represented as the object of worship to the inmates of heaven: "And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four-and-twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever;" for this description of the person whom they worshipped is identically the same as that by which Christ designates himself in chap. i. 18, "I am he that liveth, and was dead: and, behold, I am alive for evermore." In the Greek the expressions are precisely the same in the two passages; or, if we exclude the words "him that liveth for ever and ever" from the text of REV. v. 14, as GRIESBACH does, we have then a more *direct* argument; for the passage will read thus: "the elders fell down and worshipped;" *i.e.*, they worshipped "him that sitteth upon the throne and the Lamb," mentioned in the preceding verse.

The book of the REVELATION closes with a solemn prayer to Christ, chap. xxii. 20, "Even so come, Lord Jesus."

II. I SHALL NOW PRODUCE ANOTHER CLASS OF PROOFS; NAMELY, PASSAGES IN WHICH DIVINE ATTRIBUTES OR PRIVILEGES ARE ASCRIBED IN COMMON TO CHRIST, AND JEHOVAH, OR GOD.

The kingdom of God is represented as the kingdom of Christ, EPH. v. 5, "No whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man which is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God."

The Apostles are the servants of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ in the same sense, as in James i. 1, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ;" for there is not any expression here which could convey the idea of any distinction.

Christ, under the designation of the Lamb, is associated with "him that sitteth upon the throne," as the object of worship and adoration to the inhabitants of heaven; as in REV. v. 11-13, "And I beheld, and I

heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders : and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands ; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever." Now upon the principle asserted by ISAIAH, chap. xlviii. 11, "that God will not give his glory to another," and also as there could not be idolatry or creature-worship in heaven, "the Lamb that was slain" must have been invested with the One Godhead with the Father, in order to justify his being thus associated with the Father, as the object of the most sublime, ample, and emphatic ascription of homage which the Bible contains.

In REV. xx. 6, we read that they who have part in the first resurrection "shall be priests of God and of Christ." Now, as a priest is the servant of Deity, this passage either inculcates idolatry, or the doctrine of the Deity of Christ.

By comparing REV. xxii. 6 with REV. xxii. 16, we have a strong proof of Christ's Deity. The former passage is, "The Lord God of the holy prophets sent *his* angel to show unto his servants the things which must shortly be done." The latter passage is, "I Jesus have sent *mine* angel to testify unto you these things in the church." Now the angel sent is, in both these verses, asserted to be the angel of the sender, who is called in one passage, "the Lord God of the holy prophets," and in the other, "Jesus." The inference is unavoidable, that these are two designations of Christ.

In the Epistle of Paul to Titus, the Apostle, in

speaking upon the redemption by Christ, uses indifferently the expressions "God our Saviour," and "Christ our Saviour," in such a form as to identify God and Christ. As, for instance, TITUS i. 3, "According to the commandment of *God our Saviour*;" chap. i. 4, "Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and the Lord *Jesus Christ our Saviour*;" chap. ii. 10, "That they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things;" chap. ii. 13, "The glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;" chap. iii. 4, "The kindness and love of God our Saviour towards man;" chap. iii. 6, "Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." Now upon these verses, I remark, that it is to salvation in the highest sense of the word to which the apostle alludes; but Jehovah has said (ISAIAH xliii. 11), "I, even I, am the Lord; and besides me there is no Saviour:" it therefore follows, unavoidably, that the names "Christ" and "God," which are interchanged in the above passages and in many others, are common designations of the ONE Saviour. Or if we even admit that the title "God our Saviour" refers to the Father, still as Christ is also called our Saviour in the same sense, the same conclusion must follow, that he is one God with the Father, since it is the universal doctrine of the Bible, that there is but ONE Saviour in the sense spoken of in these passages.

III. I SHALL NOW ADVANCE A THIRD CLASS OF PROOFS; NAMELY, OF INSTANCES IN WHICH DECLARATIONS AND ASCRIPTIONS, PECULIARLY REFERRING TO DEITY IN ONE PART OF SCRIPTURE, ARE REFERRED TO CHRIST IN ANOTHER.

In ISAIAH, chap. vi., we have an account of the prophet receiving his commission from a being who is described as "the Lord," the "Lord of hosts," sitting upon the throne of supreme and universal empire, before whom the angels worshipped, and whose glory

is described as filling the whole earth ; or who, in one word, is the true God. But according to the testimony of JOHN, chap. xii. 41, it was Christ in his pre-existent Deity whom the prophet saw ; for the Apostle, having just quoted from the 9th and 10th verses of this chapter of Isaiah, the commission which the prophet received, immediately adds, in reference to the vision which accompanied the delivery of this commission, "These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory (*i.e.*, Christ's glory), and spake of him."

In ISA. xliii. 11, Jehovah is represented as saying, "I, even I, am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour." But in 2 PET. iii. 18, these titles, which are described as the exclusive attributes of Deity, are given to Christ: "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

In ISA. xlv. 22, 23, Jehovah is represented as saying, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth ; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." But the Apostle Paul, in ROM. xiv. 10, 11, expressly quotes these words with a direct application to Christ: "For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God."

In ISA. viii. 13-15, Jehovah is thus described: "Sanctify Jehovah of hosts himself ; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary ; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken." But this description is, in 1 PET. ii. 7, 8, referred to Christ: "Unto you therefore which believe he is precious : but unto

them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient."

In ISA. xl. 3, it is prophesied that John the Baptist should be "the voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." But in LUKE iii. 4, this prophecy is said to be fulfilled by John's appearing to prepare the way of Christ: "As it is written in the book of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight."

In ISA. liv. 5, the following address is made by the prophet to the Church: "For thy maker is thine husband, the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel." But in the New Testament, the person spoken of in this passage as the Lord of hosts and the Holy One of Israel is said to be Christ; as in JOHN iii. 29, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom;" and in 2 COR. xi. 2, "For I have espoused you to *one husband*, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to *Christ*;" and ROM. vii. 4, "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God."

In PSALM lxviii. 18, 19, the Psalmist, addressing God, who is mentioned in the 16th verse, says, "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them. Blessed be the Lord, who daily loadeth us with benefits, even the God of our salvation." But in EPH. iv. 7, 8, this is interpreted as referring to Christ: "But unto every one of us is given grace according to the



measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men."

In NEH. ix. 6, Jehovah is thus addressed in his character as Creator: "Thou, even thou, art Lord alone: thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all." But in COL. i. 15, 16, this passage is virtually quoted and applied to Christ: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

In DEUT. xxx. 20, it is said of the Lord God, "He is thy life." But in JOHN xi. 25, Christ assumes to himself this designation, "I am the resurrection and the life;" and in COL. iii. 4, the Apostle makes a similar declaration, "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear," &c.

In MATT. iv. 10, the following doctrine is laid down by Christ as a guide for all created beings: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." But in HEB. i. 6, we find this command issued by God the Father in reference to the Son: "Let all the angels of God worship him."

In ZECH. xii. 10, Jehovah is represented as saying in prophecy, "They shall look upon me whom they have pierced;" and in JOHN xix. 37, this passage is said to have been fulfilled in Christ, "And again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced;" also in REV. i. 7, "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him."

In PSALM lxxviii. 56, it is said of the Israelites, that

“they tempted and provoked the Most High God ;” and in 1 COR. x. 9, the Apostle says to Christians, “Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted ;” by which reference he not merely represents Christ as sustaining towards the Christian Church the very same relationship which the Most High God sustained towards the Jewish Church (namely, being the object of direct offence by sin, a relationship which none but God can sustain), but he also explicitly asserts Christ to have been the Most High God, whom the Israelites tempted.

In PSALM lxxxiii. 18, Jehovah is said to be the exclusive title of the Most High God : “That men may know that thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the Most High over all the earth.” But in JER. xxiii. 6, this title is given to Christ : “And this is his name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our Righteousness.”

In ACTS xxii. we have a narrative of the conversion of Paul, in which Ananias is represented as telling Saul that he was “chosen by the God of their fathers :” verses 14 and 15, “The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldst know his will and see that Just One, and shouldst hear the voice of his mouth ; for thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard.” Now it is evident that, by “the God of our fathers,” and “the Just One,” in this passage, we are to understand the Lord Jesus Christ, because it was he whose voice Paul heard (ACTS ix. 4), and whose witness it was his office as an Apostle to be. But this is placed beyond all question by the fact that there is another narrative, in ACTS ix. 15-17, of the very same interview with Ananias, which merely differs from this by interpreting the “God of their fathers” to be Jesus : “But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way : for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel : for I will show him how great things he must

suffer for my name's sake. And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house ; and putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord (*even Jesus*, that appeared unto thee in the way that thou camest) hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost."

In ROM. viii. 33, the sinner's justification is described as the work of God : "It is God that justifieth." But in ISA. liii. 11, it is ascribed to Christ : "By his knowledge (*i.e.*, by giving a saving knowledge of himself) shall my righteous servant justify many."

In 1 THESS. v. 23, sanctification is represented as the work of God : "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly." But in HEB. xiii. 12, it is represented as the work of Christ : "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate."

In EPHES. iii. 2, 3, Paul attributes the reception of his apostolic instructions to the revelation of God : "If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward ; how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery." But in GAL. i. 12, he attributes his knowledge of the Gospel to the revelation of Christ exclusively : "For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

The efficient source of the miracles by which the Apostles' preaching was attested, is referred indifferently to Christ and God, as in MARK xvi. 20, "They went forth and preached everywhere, *the Lord* working with them, and confirming the words with signs following." Compared with HEB. ii. 3, 4, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him ; *God also bearing them witness*, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will."

In JER. xvii. 5 and 7, it is said by Jehovah, "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord. . . . Blessed is the man who trusteth in the Lord, whose hope the Lord is." But this blessedness is associated with trusting in Christ, in the declaration of the Psalmist, PSALM ii. 12, "Blessed are all they that put their trust in him;" and in the experience and anticipations of the Apostle Paul, "I know in whom I have trusted (for so the word means), and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day," 2 Tim. i. 12.

In PSALM xxxvi. 6, Jehovah is thus addressed; "O Lord! thou preservest man and beast;" and in COL. i. 17, the same work of providence is ascribed to Christ: "For by him all things consist."

Christ is Jehovah, the Shepherd of the Jewish Church, and also the one common Shepherd of the extended and united Church of Jews and Gentiles; for we read, in JOHN x. 16, these remarkable words: "Other sheep I HAVE which are not of this fold: them also I MUST BRING, and they shall hear MY VOICE; and there shall be ONE FOLD, and ONE Shepherd;" and the rank of this Shepherd is determined by the Psalmist in Psalm xxiii., "Jehovah is my Shepherd, I shall not want: HE maketh me to lie down in green pastures; HE leadeth me beside the still waters." This argument will also appear more striking by a reference to JOHN x. 14, where he calls himself the "good Shepherd;" to HEB. xiii. 20, where he is styled the "great Shepherd of the sheep;" to 1 PETER v. 4, where he is styled the *chief* Shepherd;" and to REV. vii. 17, where the care and kindness of Jehovah the Shepherd is distinctly referred to Christ: "The Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

The Church also stands in the very same relationship

to Christ and Jehovah as sheep; for we read in PSALM lxxiv. 1, "O God, why hast thou cast us off for ever? why doth thine anger smoke against the sheep of thy pasture?" and Christ says, in JOHN x. 27, "*My* sheep hear my voice;" and in JOHN xxi. 17, "Feed *my* sheep."

In 1 KINGS viii. 39, Solomon thus addresses Jehovah: "For thou, even thou, only knowest the hearts of all the children of men." But in JOHN vi. 64, a knowledge equivalent to this is ascribed to Christ, "For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him;" and in ACTS i. 24, the Apostles addressed Christ thus, "Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men;" and in MATT. xii. 25, we read, "Jesus knew their thoughts;" and also in Luke vi. 8; and again, in JOHN vi. 61, it is said, that "Jesus knew in himself (*i. e.*, not by communication) that his disciples murmured;" and in JOHN ii. 24, it is still more emphatically asserted, that he did not obtain his knowledge by communication or derivation of any kind: "But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man."

The forgiveness of sins is ascribed indifferently to Christ and God; as in EPH. iv. 32, "Be kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you;" and in COL. iii. 13, the exercise of the same divine prerogative is ascribed to Christ in terms which are evidently a paraphrase of the above: "Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye."

In MAL. iii. 6, immutability is represented as an attribute of Jehovah, "I am the Lord, I change not." But in HEB. i. 12, the same attribute is ascribed to Christ, "But thou art the same;" and in HEB. xiii. 8,

“Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.”

In REV. xx. 12, the dead are described as standing before God for judgment: “And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.” But in 2 COR. v. 10, he who is called God in REVELATION, is called Christ: “For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.”

There are also several other passages in which the judgment of the world is referred to Jehovah, which, when taken in contrast with others in which Christ is spoken of in the same direct and emphatic terms as the Judge, must necessarily prove his true and proper Deity. This argument will appear evident from a comparison of the two following classes of texts, viz. :—

*Texts describing God or Jehovah  
as Judge.*

But Jehovah shall endure for ever: he hath prepared his throne for judgment; and he shall judge the world in righteousness.—PSALM ix. 7, 8.

Our God shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice. And the heavens shall declare his righteousness: for God is judge himself.—PSALM l. 4-6.

For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret

*Texts describing Christ as  
Judge.*

When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations.—MATT. xxv. 31, 32.

For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.—1 THESS. iv. 16, 17.

Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will

thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.—ECCLES. xii. 14.

And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; . . . and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.—REV. xx. 12.

bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts.—1 COR. iv. 5.

We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.—2 COR. v. 10.

The inference from the comparison of these passages in support of the true Deity of Christ, receives, if possible, additional strength, from the consideration that “the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son,” JOHN v. 22. It is therefore evident, that the Jehovah or God who is described as Judge, is not to be understood of the Father, but of the Son; who, because he has assumed human nature and become the Son of man, possesses, in addition to the *necessary* qualifications with which he is endowed as God, the advantages of visibility, which neither the Father nor the Son possess in reference to their essential Godhead. And we may legitimately infer, from the mere fact of Christ’s being exhibited as the destined Judge of all men, that he must in some sense possess the knowledge, the power, the authority, and judicial prerogatives of true Deity, in order to justify his being represented as sustaining so high and arduous an office.

Christ occupies the very same position in relation to the Christian Church, which Jehovah occupied in relation to the Jewish Church. For example: The Jewish Church assembled in the name of Jehovah (EXOD. xx. 24); the Christian Church assemble in the name of Christ (MATT. xviii. 20). The passover is called the Lord’s passover (EXOD. xii. 11); which Christ abolished (EPH. ii. 15), and substituted a supper of communion in remembrance of himself (LUKE xxii. 19). The Sabbath, the day of rest to the Jewish Church, is called the Sabbath of the Lord their God (EXOD. xx. 10); which Christ, through his Apostles,



abolished (COL. ii. 16), and instituted in its stead the first day of the week, which is called the Lord's Day (REV. i. 10). Moses and the prophets, the ministers of the Jewish Church, performed their miracles through the power of Jehovah (PSA. lxxviii. 43); the Apostles, the ministers of the Christian Church, performed their miracles in the name and by the power of Christ (MARK xvi. 20; ACTS iii. 6; ix. 34). And the Jewish Church are described as those whom the Lord God had chosen to be a peculiar people *unto himself* (DEUT. xiv. 2); and the Christian Church are described as those for whom Christ gave himself, that he might purify *unto himself a peculiar people* (TIT. ii. 14). From these examples, it must follow that Christ is the Jehovah of the Old Testament; as we could not suppose that an inferior and created minister of God would have thus placed himself in the exact relative position of that God who sent him. And this argument receives additional force—if possible—when we consider that the introduction of Christianity was, in one sense, a breaking down of the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles; so that he who is now the God of Jews and Gentiles in the Christian Church, is the one being who was in a special sense the God of the Jews only (ROM. iii. 29).

I would here remark, that there are two methods of argument by which we may arrive at the conclusion in support of the Deity of Christ, from the comparison of passages in which Jehovah or God is spoken of, with others in which either the same passages are referred to Christ, or in which divine attributes which the former speak of, are in the same sense ascribed to him. 1st, This comparison either identifies Christ with the Jehovah or God who is spoken of in the one passage, and thus *directly* proves his Deity; or, 2dly, If we admit that, in the passages in which the name of Jehovah or God occurs, the person of the Father is meant, then the parallel texts which speak of Christ in the

same sense, ascribing to him the same divine characteristics and attributes with the Father, prove him to be the one God with the Father, and so indirectly, but as validly, demonstrate his true Deity. Thus, for instance, it is said, in PSALM lxxxiii. 18, that the Israelites tempted the Most High God in the desert ; but, in 1 COR. x. 9, Paul asserts, in reference to the same circumstance, that it was Christ whom they tempted. Now, I can arrive at a valid conclusion, substantiating the true Deity of Christ, from a comparison of these passages, by either at once inferring that Christ, in his pre-existent Deity, was the Most High God, whom the Israelites tempted ; or, admitting the Most High God to be meant by the Psalmist of the Father, I have an instance of Christ's being associated with the Father as the one object against whom the Israelites sinned ; and therefore I necessarily infer that Christ was the Most High God with the Father.

IV. I SHALL NOW ADVANCE ANOTHER CLASS OF PROOFS—NAMELY, INSTANCES OF CHRIST'S ASSUMING OR APPLYING TO HIMSELF DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE, OR ATTRIBUTES ELSEWHERE REFERRING TO JEHOVAH OR GOD.

In EXOD. xx. 24, God is represented as making this promise to the Jewish Church, "In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee." But Christ, in the New Testament, represents himself as sustaining the very same relationship to the Christian Church, by recording two precisely similar promises, in MATT. xviii. 20, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them ;" and in MATT. xxviii. 20, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Upon this comparison, I remark : 1st, It must obviously require the divine faculty of being omnipresent, in order to enable a person who made these promises to fulfil them ; and, 2dly, If Christ

were a creature infinitely inferior to the true God, a promise of *his* perpetual presence would have been of no value. A promise of the presence and protection of God, delivered authoritatively by Jesus his Messenger, would have been alone serviceable, and could alone have prevented the Jewish Church from possessing an infinitely higher advantage than the Christian, by enjoying the presence and protection of Jehovah himself.

In MATT. v. 21, and throughout his entire sermon, Christ contrasts his own instructions with the commandments of Jehovah to the Jews, so as to assume to himself the very same legislative prerogatives and authority: "Ye have heard that it was said *to* them of old time" (for so it is in the Greek); "but I say unto you." What creature could presume to improve upon the language of a commandment of Jehovah?

In ISA. xl. 10, we read, "Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him." But in REV. xxii. 12, Christ applies the very same language to himself, and assumes to himself the same divine prerogative of rewarding: "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be."

In 1 COR. vi. 14, it is said, "God hath both raised up the Lord." But in JOHN ii. 19, Christ asserts, in reference to his resurrection, "Destroy this temple, and *I will raise it up in three days.*" Upon which comparison I remark, that Christ must have been possessed of a divine nature, distinct from his human body, which divine nature raised up that body; and which was so connected with it at the time he made this declaration, as to justify his speaking in the first person singular—"I will raise it up;" and that this was true, is evident from his calling his body a temple, on seeing the temple of Jerusalem. That temple was the house of Jehovah; and his body is so styled, be-

cause "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

In 1 COR. vi. 14, it is also said, "God will raise up us by his own power." But in JOHN vi. 39, 40, 44, 54, Christ says, four times, in reference to his people, "I WILL RAISE HIM up at the last day;" therefore, Christ is either that God who will raise the dead, or he is one with the Father in the exercise of that divine prerogative and power.

In ISA. xlv. 6, we read, "Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no god." But in REV. i. 17; ii. 8; xxii. 13, Christ assumes this title to himself by saying, "I am the first and the last;" upon which I remark, 1st, If we understand this title as designating eternal existence, then it is evident that Christ must be the *one* true and everlasting God with Jehovah, as no two perfectly distinct beings could say of themselves with truth, "I am the first and the last;" or, 2dly, If we understand the words as denoting the first cause and final object of all things, it equally proves his true Deity.

Christ promises to give to his disciples that wisdom which the Apostle directs them to pray to *God* for. LUKE xxi. 15, "For I WILL GIVE you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist." Compared with JAMES i. 5, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of *God*, that *giveth* to all liberally," &c.

In PSALM vii. 9, it is said, "The righteous God trieth the hearts and reins;" and in JER. xvii. 10, "I Jehovah search the heart; I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings." But in REV. ii. 23, Christ not only assumes to himself these two divine prerogatives of searching the reins and the heart, and of exercising retributive justice, but expressly *identifies himself with*

*Jehovah, who speaks in this passage* by quoting it in direct application to himself: "And all the churches shall know that *I am he which* searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." Here, I simply ask, can any one have the hardihood to maintain, or even to insinuate, that Christ might have made an unjustifiable quotation, and incorrect application to himself of the words of the Prophet?

From the language which Christ adopts in his addresses to the seven churches in Asia, in REV. ii. and iii., we infer his possession of the attributes and prerogatives of Deity. He does not use that style of address which a created being, acting as the inferior agent of God, would naturally employ, and always did employ, by saying, "Thus saith Jehovah." But he says, "I know thy works," &c.; "I have somewhat against thee;" "To him that overcometh, *will I give* to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God;" "Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly;" "He that overcometh, and keepeth my words unto the end, to him *will I give* power over the nations;" "*I will not blot* his name out of the book of life;" "He that openeth, and no man (or "no one") shutteth; he that shutteth, and no one openeth;" "Thou hast kept *my* word, and hast not denied *my* name;" "I will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world;" "Him that overcometh, *will I make* a pillar in the temple of my God;" "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten;" "To him that overcometh *will I grant* to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Upon these passages it is obvious to remark, that the assumption of independent and underived knowledge—of authority to dispense the blessedness and the dignities of heaven—of power to exercise retributive justice—of the possession of irresistible dominion over the condition of

men—and of preserving, correcting, punishing, and rewarding the members of his churches, which they contain—is totally unaccountable upon any principle but that which admits and recognises him as the one God with the Father. And as the threats denounced against the Asiatic churches have been fulfilled by rendering the ordinary arrangements of Providence the instruments of their accomplishment, it is evident that Christ has, in these passages, represented himself as the God of Providence, who can alone order all things for the accomplishment of *his* purposes.

In MATT. xxiii. 37, Christ assumes the language, and places himself in the position of the God of Israel: “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often *would I* have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!” How easy is it here to apply the principle by which the identity of PETER was ascertained, “Thy speech bewrayeth thee!” (MATT. xxvi. 73); for this is precisely an appropriation to himself, on the part of Christ, of the office of president and protector of the Jewish people which Jehovah sustained, as is manifest from comparing it with the similar descriptions of Jehovah in the Old Testament; as in DEUT. xxxii. 11, “As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings; so the Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange god with him.” And in PSALM xci. 4, “He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust.” And in JER. xxix. 19, “Because they have not hearkened unto my words, saith the Lord, which I sent unto them by my servants the prophets, rising up early and sending; but *ye would not hear*, saith the Lord.” And in PSALM lxxxi. 11-14, “But my people *would not* hearken to my voice; and Israel would none of me. So I gave them up unto their own hearts’ lust; and they

walked in their own counsels. Oh that my people had hearkened unto me, and Israel had walked in my ways! I should soon have subdued their enemies, and turned my hand against their adversaries."

V. I SHALL NOW ADVANCE PROOFS OF THAT PART OF MY SECOND PROPOSITION WHICH ASSERTS THAT CHRIST POSSESSES AS TO HIS DIVINE NATURE, THE SAME ETERNITY, KNOWLEDGE, POWER, AUTHORITY, PREROGATIVES, AND GODHEAD, WITH THE FATHER, AND IS ONE WITH HIM IN ALL ATTRIBUTES. And this I shall do by advancing passages in which divine attributes and prerogatives are referred in common to Christ and the Father. [I should, however, premise that in some of the passages which I shall advance, it might be questioned whether it be the person of the Father who is exclusively referred to, and not the Divine Being in a general sense; but it is evident that, according to the principles of those who differ from us, I have a right to *assume*, though I would not *admit*, that wherever the word God occurs in Scripture, the person of the Father is meant.]

The Apostle Paul, at the commencement of most of his Epistles, associates the Lord Jesus Christ with the Father, as the person to whom he prays for a dispensation of the highest spiritual blessings: as, for instance, in ROM. i. 7, "Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ." In other places he represents Christ, without mentioning the Father, as the dispenser of the same blessings: as in 1 COR. xvi. 23, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you;" and 2 TIM. i. 16, "The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus;" and ver. 18, "The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day."

In 1 THESS. iii. 11-13, he also associates Christ with the Father as the object of prayer, and as having the same power with him to control the affairs of providence: "Now God himself and our Father, and



our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you ;” and then he continues his petition to Christ, under the title Lord, for spiritual blessings: “And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you ; to the end he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.” There is a similar prayer in 2 THESS. ii. 16-17, in which Christ, in order of address, is placed before the Father : “Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation, and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.”

The Lord Jesus Christ and the Father are represented in Scripture as *equally* entitled to the worship of all created beings, as is proved by the fact that doxologies of precisely similar form, and containing the same ascriptions, are offered to both ; as in 2 PET. iii. 18, “Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ : to whom be glory both now and for ever. Amen.” Compared with that in 1 PET. v. 11, offered up to the God of all grace, whom we assume to be the Father: “To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever.”

In HEB. i. 1, God the Father is represented as the person who spake by the prophets : “God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.” But in 1 PET. i. 10-11, it is asserted that Christ, in his pre-existent deity, was the author of the inspiration of the prophets, “Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you ; searching what, or what manner of time *the Spirit of Christ which was in them* did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the

glory that should follow ;” and also in 1 PET. iii. 19, Christ is represented as having inspired Noah, the preacher of righteousness to the antediluvian world : “ For Christ also hath once suffered for sin, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God ; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit ; by which also *he* went and preached unto the spirits in prison,” &c.

Christ, as Lord, is one with the Father, as proprietor of the temple at Jerusalem, for we read in JOHN ii. 16, “ Make not *my Father's house* an house of merchandise ;” and in MAL. iii. 1, we read of Christ, “ The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to *his temple*.”

Christ is associated with the Father, as the person to whom believers are solemnly dedicated at baptism, as in MATT. xxviii. 19, “ Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

It is said in 1 JOHN ii. 22-24, that it is of *equal* importance that the Christian should have faith, and continue in the faith of both the Son and the Father : “ He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father. . . . Ye also shall continue in the Son and in the Father.” Also in 1 JOHN i. 3, Christians are represented as having fellowship equally with both persons : “ And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.”

VI. I SHALL NOW ADVANCE PASSAGES IN WHICH CHRIST ASCRIBES TO HIMSELF DIVINE ATTRIBUTES AND PREROGATIVES IN COMMON WITH THE FATHER (WHOSE DEITY I ASSUME), OR ELSEWHERE ASCRIBED TO THE FATHER.

In MATT. xi. 27, Christ says, “ All things are delivered unto me of my Father ;” and it is an obvious principle that the receiver must have a capacity of receiving coextensive with the nature of the things received.

In the same verse he declares that his nature is equally inscrutable and incomprehensible as the Father's : " And no man knoweth the Son but the Father ; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son ; and he to whom soever the Son will reveal him."

In JOHN, chap. v., there are several declarations made by the Saviour, asserting his perfect oneness in attributes and prerogatives with the Father, interspersed, according to Scripture, with declarations which refer to his mediatorial office and subordination, as, for instance,

In verse 17, he says, " My father worketh hitherto, and I work ;" which implies, as is evident from the context, " My father has been engaged upon the Sabbath day, and every day alike, up to the present moment, in sustaining the office of providence, and I have been doing the same ;" or, " I work miracles upon the Sabbath-day by the very same right by which my Father works upon the Sabbath-day."

In verse 18, we find the Jews understanding him as representing himself equal to the Father : " Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said that God was his Father, making himself equal to God ;" or rather, " said that God was in such a peculiar sense his Father, as to represent himself to be equal to God." It is not, however, from the view in which the Jews understood him that I argue, but from Christ's proceeding in the sequel to sanction and confirm their view.

In verse 19, " Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do ;" that is, " The Son and the Father are so closely and intimately one in power and operation, that the Son can do nothing of himself (or distinct from the Father), but what he seeth the Father do ;" as is evident from the most remarkable words which follow, as the reason of this declaration, and which would be blasphemy in the

mouth of a created and finite being : “ *For* what things soever he doeth, these (or rather ‘the same’) also doeth the Son likewise” (or, “in the same manner”).

In verse 21, “As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom *he will*.”

In verse 22, “For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.” The receiving such a commission implies, necessarily, his antecedent possession of every divine quality to enable him to perform the work : and I would also remark, that as the Father judgeth no man, consequently, in arguing for the Deity of the Father and the Son, from the divine works performed by them, we have more evidence for the Deity of the Son than we have for the Deity of the Father ; for though it is true that “whatsoever things the Father doeth, the same doeth the Son likewise,” yet the proposition cannot be converted so as to say, “Whatsoever things the Son doeth, the same doeth the Father likewise.”

Verse 23, “That all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father, which hath sent him.”

In JOHN x. 27-38, he asserts the possession of the same power with the Father to protect his people against all their spiritual adversaries : “My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me ; and I give unto them eternal life ; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of *my* hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all ; and none is able to pluck them out of *my* Father’s hand. I and my Father are one.” By the latter declaration, in which he sums up into one comprehensive assertion the substance of the two preceding verses for the consolation and security of his people, he evidently must mean, one in power and superiority to all their enemies, and in affection towards his people, It was in this sense that the Jews understood him ; for they

immediately took up stones to stone him, as a blasphemer; upon which Christ proceeds with his discourse, from verse 32 to 38, which consists of *two* parts: 1st, a justification of his words, from the 32d to the 36th verses; and 2dly, an explanation of their meaning in verses 37 and 38; "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, though you believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him." Now it is evident that this latter declaration is even stronger than the former ("I and my Father are one"); for it denotes not a mere simple unity of connection but a unity of reciprocity and of mutual indwelling; and it had the very same effect upon the Jews, of leading them to regard him as a blasphemer, upon which he took no further trouble to do away their impressions, but worked a miracle to release himself from their malignity: "Therefore, they sought again to take him; but he escaped out of their hands,"—evidently leaving them, as we must argue, upon every principle of duty and piety, in possession of the correct meaning of his two declarations in the 30th and 38th verses.

In JOHN x. 15, he asserts his possession of a knowledge of the Father, equal to the knowledge which the Father has of him: "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father." Now, although we may say that God knows every creature to perfection, yet we may truly address every created being in the universe in the language of Zophar: "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" Surely a created and finite intelligence, which knows his Creator even as the scrutinising omniscience of his Creator knows him, is an anomaly which neither can nor does exist!

In JOHN xiv. 9, 10, he asserts his oneness with the Father to be so complete and perfect, that he who hath seen him hath seen the Father: "Philip saith unto him, Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us.

Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father. Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?" And then he proceeds still further to give evidence of the perfect oneness that subsists between them; *a oneness so perfect and so close, as to admit of no distinctness or independence of power, authority, or operation whatsoever, on the part of the Son, in his divine nature, from the Father*: "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself (that is, as a separate being from the Father, as Philip supposed); but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works."

On comparing JOHN xiv. 14 with xvi. 23, we find that Christ and the Father are *equally* employed in answering the prayers of the Church. The former passage is, "If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it;" and the latter, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." And I would here remark, that the same Apostle, John, who has recorded these two declarations, enlarges upon the former in his first Epistle, v. 14, 15, in a manner which shows that he recognised the correctness of directing our petitions to the Son of God, as well as to the Father: "And this is the confidence that we have in him (the Son of God), that if we ask any thing according to his will, *he* heareth us; and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him."

In JOHN xiv. 23, Christ asserts his possession of the same faculty of being universally and permanently present with his people, as the Father possessed; and represents the promise of his presence as equally valuable to his people, as that of his Father: "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." We may also remark, upon this passage,

that it connects the promise of God's presence with the love of Christ, and not of the Father ; so that if Christ is not one God with the Father, we have here an instance of God surrendering his glory and prerogatives to a creature !

In JOHN xvi. 15, we read this declaration of the Saviour, "All things that the Father hath are mine ;" and, in JOHN xvii. 10, a similar one, "And all mine are thine, *and thine are mine.*" Here are two explicit assertions of a common proprietorship with the Father, in all that belongs to the Father, from one "who did no sin, neither was any guile found in his mouth."

In JOHN xvii. 5, he represents himself as having enjoyed glory with the Father's *own self* before the world was : "And now, O Father ! glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." And in this prayer, which he offers up during the season in which that glory was suspended, he plainly represents his glory, both retrospectively and prospectively, to be the one and the same glory with the Father's.

He represents himself as being one with the Father, in the important work of setting himself apart to his mediatorial office ; as in JOHN x. 36, "Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world ;" compared with JOHN xvii. 19, "And for this purpose *I sanctify myself*, that they also might be sanctified by the truth."

He represents himself as possessing an independent and personal power, not only to lay down his life, but to resume it again ; as in JOHN x. 18, "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again ;" and yet it is asserted in ROM. vi. 4, that Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father. The power, therefore, which was displayed in this instance, must have been a power mutually possessed, and mutually exerted ; or, in other words, the Father and the Son were *one* in the possession of



that exceeding great and mighty power which the apostle says was displayed in the resurrection of Christ from the dead.

He declares himself to be one with the Father in the exercise of the divine prerogative of *rewarding*, as is evident from a comparison of MATT. vi. 4, "Thy Father, which seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly," with MATT. xvi. 27, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then *he shall reward every* man according to his works;" and also, on referring to ROM. ii. 6, we find that this is the province of "*God, who will reward every one according to his works.*"

He represents himself as possessing the *same* ability with the Father to work the miracles which he performed; as his question to the blind men, in which there is not the slightest reference to a *superior* or more efficient power, clearly implies: "Believe ye that *I am* able to do this?" MATT. ix. 28; and as his exact recognition of the ascription of an ability which could be exerted at will, contained in his reply to the leper's supplication, in MATT. viii. 2, also shows: "Lord, if thou wilt thou canst make me clean;" upon which Jesus said, "*I will*, be thou clean;" language as precisely indicative of his possession of an irresistible power, independent of all distinct or higher control, as the statement in GEN. i. 3, "God said, Let there be light, and there was light." Elsewhere, however, he says, "The Father which dwelleth in me, he doeth the works" (JOHN xiv. 10); thereby implying, that though his ability to perform his miracles was uncontrolled by any superior power, yet it was equal to, or rather one and the same power with the Father's.

Christ was one with the Father, in sending the Holy Ghost to the Apostles, as is evident from JOHN xvi. 7, "If I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, *I will send* him unto you;" compared with JOHN xiv. 26, "The Comforter, which

is the Holy Ghost, whom *the Father will send* in my name," &c.

Christ assumes to himself the same prerogative of rebuking and chastening with the Father, as is manifest from his declaration in REV. iii. 19, "As many as I love *I* rebuke and chasten;" compared with HEB. xii. 6, 7, "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, *God dealeth* with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not?"

In REV. xxi. 6, 7, Christ distinctly assumes to himself the title of God, and the prerogatives of Deity; "And he said unto me, it is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son."

These passages, which I have now advanced, constitute a portion of the scriptural material upon the ground of which I argue for the true Deity of Christ. From this induction of Scripture testimony I derive this conclusion: That the Lord Jesus Christ, who appeared in the flesh in order to become a mediator between God and man, possessed a nature distinct from that humanity in which he tabernacled; that, in reference to this superior nature, he is described as bearing the titles, possessing the characteristics, performing the works, exercising the prerogatives, and receiving the honours of Deity; that he represents himself, and is represented by others, as being one with the Father in the possession of all the essential attributes which are ascribed to the Father. I therefore conclude that in his superior nature Christ is true God, possessing the same eternity, power, authority, and Godhead with the Father, and one with him in all attributes.

## SECOND DAY.

MR BAGOT.—It falls to my lot, in consequence of the arrangements which have been adopted, to commence the discussion on this day. You are aware that, according to the printed regulations, no reply to the arguments of the first speaker could have been permitted on yesterday ; but each was engaged to give a statement of the positive sentiments which he entertained, in reference to the subject of discussion, and to illustrate that statement by positive and affirmative proofs. I feel obliged to Mr Porter for the plan he has already pursued, for he has saved me a vast degree of trouble. We may be compared to two architects who were employed to build a temple ; and I trust that on yesterday I adhered closely to this object. I endeavoured to lay Christ Jesus as the foundation-stone ; I called to my assistance the Apostles and Prophets as fellow-workers in rearing the superstructure ; and I completed my work by exhibiting Christ Jesus as the topstone. But what did Mr Porter do ? *1st*—He occupied one hour at least in clearing away the obstructions to my building, by detailing the origin of this discussion, and the progress of our correspondence, of which it was quite sufficient to know the *result*, as stated in the printed prospectus of the rules. *2dly*—He erected a very small edifice for himself, which, however, he immediately overthrew. And *3dly*—He came over to me, and for the remainder of his time assisted me in building my house. I had expected that he would have advanced affirmative proofs for the strong affirmative doctrines which he has embodied in his two propositions. I had expected him to have advanced posi-

tive arguments in support of his first proposition, that the Father *only* is the only true God ; and of his second proposition, that the Lord Jesus Christ is (even in his highest capacity) a created being : but for neither of these tenets did he advance anything like satisfactory proof. I must advert, however, to the remarks which he did unequivocally advance. He occupied our time with censures upon the Scriptures, both in the translation and in the original. He described the translation in ordinary use as being incrustated with numerous imperfections and defects. I ask in reply, if he really believes this description to be correct, how does he maintain his own consistency as a minister of religion, in standing up in this place of worship, Sabbath after Sabbath, to read to his congregation a translation of the Bible which he represents as so erroneous and defective ? He is not fettered by any ecclesiastical canons or regulations, which would restrict him to the exclusive use of King James's translation ; and he may adopt what is termed the "Improved Version of the New Testament," which might perhaps come nearer to his ideas of perfection as a translation, than the ordinary version. But the character which Mr Porter has given of the common translation is, I hesitate not to say, unjustifiable and unwarranted. I argue not for the infallibility or inspiration of the translators, nor for the *perfect* integrity of the work they have produced. I admit that there are defects in that work, but they are not connected with any point of doctrine, or rule of practice, so as to impair the distinctness of the one, or to blunt the moral cogency of the other ; but, just as the astronomer discerns spots in the sun, which do not prevent the inhabitants of our world from receiving all that illumination and guidance which his brightness is calculated to afford ; so, although the critical student of the Bible may discern some defects in its translation, yet still the commonly received version is sufficiently accurate to answer that important object for which a

revelation has been imparted—to be “a guide to our feet, and a lantern to our paths.” And if a new translation were faithfully executed, I have no hesitation to assert, that it would be far more favourable to the inculcation of the deity of Christ than the present.

But Mr Porter next alluded to the *original* texts of Scripture, which he described—I hope I commit no mistake in quoting his words—as “mutilated, interpolated, and otherwise grossly corrupted; and so as to render many passages, especially those connected with this discussion, unworthy of notice.” I beg to say to him, in the presence of this assembly, that if he entertains such an opinion in reference to Scripture, he should, in consistency, become either an Infidel or a Roman Catholic:—an Infidel, in order, on the one hand, to free himself from the perplexity of building his faith upon such a sandy foundation; or a Roman Catholic, on the other hand, in order that his creed may rest upon a basis which is *apparently* solid to the mind of every sincere member of that communion—namely, the authority and infallibility of the Church of Rome. But let me ask what description of *faith* must that man have who considers his *only rule of faith* to be “mutilated, interpolated, and otherwise grossly corrupted?” The natural tendency of preaching up such a sentiment as this, would be to promote universal religious scepticism. But is Mr Porter, and are this auditory, aware of the laborious research which Dr KENNICOTT underwent in order to ascertain the integrity of the Original Scriptures? He spent about thirty years in reviewing, collating, and comparing the different manuscripts of the Bible to which he could have access. And when this long period had brought his work to a close, he strongly lamented that he had spent his labour in vain, as he had found no important deviations from the received text. But though Dr KENNICOTT may have imagined that his labour was in vain, yet this meeting will, on the slightest reflection, perceive that he arrived

at the most desirable and important conclusion, and one which demonstrated incontrovertibly the general and minute integrity of the original text of Scripture.

I shall now allude to the commentary pronounced by Mr Porter upon some of the texts connected with this discussion. He first adverted to Acts xx. 28, "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed *the Church of God*, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Mr. Porter argued upon GRIESBACH'S authority, that the word Θεου, in the original of this passage, is spurious. For my present object I neither argue for nor against the genuineness of Θεου ; but I would just remark that this reading is well supported, and that the Vatican MS., one of the very highest authority, which GRIESBACH never saw, gives countenance to this reading. I make him, however, a present of this text, but shall first make some use of it before I part with it. I do not require it as a proof for my doctrine, nor did I quote it in my enumeration of arguments yesterday. I ask Mr Porter, then, why is he so anxious to prove that Θεου, in this passage, is not genuine ? Is not this desire to remove this word from the text necessarily based upon a tacit, and, of course, unconscious admission, that if Θεου were in the passage, it would supply me and my cause with a valid argument for the true deity of Christ ? On no other principle can Mr Porter be exonerated from the charge of introducing totally irrelevant matter into this discussion. If, then, he admits—which he must, upon every principle of consistency and straightforward reasoning—that Θεου, if in this text, would prove the deity of Christ, I hope his mind is prepared to admit the force of the application of the very same title to the Saviour in passages about the genuineness and authenticity of which there is neither question nor insinuation ; such as JOHN i. 1 ; ROM. ix. 5 ; TITUS ii. 13 ; 1 JOHN v. 20, &c., to which I yesterday referred.

Mr Porter next adverted to 1 TIM. iii. 15, 16, "But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. And, without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: *God was manifest in the flesh,*" &c. Now, in quoting this passage yesterday, I showed you that it was of no consequence whether we read Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη, or ὃς ἐφανερώθη; as in the latter case we must naturally understand ὃς to be a relative pronoun, having for its antecedent the noun substantive Θεοῦ, in the sentence "which is the church of the living God;" and we must read the intervening sentence as a parenthesis, thus, "But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God (the pillar and ground of truth, and without controversy great is the mystery of godliness), who was manifest in the flesh," &c. Mr Porter has suggested another translation of this passage, thus, "He who was manifest in the flesh was justified in the Spirit," &c.; by which rendering he translates ὃς as an adjective; but I simply reply to this, that it is contrary to every rule and principle of Greek syntax to translate ὃς in this manner, unless where we cannot possibly find an antecedent in the preceding context, which is not the case in this passage. But these remarks are based upon the supposition of rejecting Θεὸς from the text, which I would not for a moment assent to—because I have evidence internal and external to support the received reading. 1st, I ask any man of plain sense what becomes of "the mystery," if the word "God" be taken away? If you extract the one, you necessarily remove the other; for to what could the "mystery," of which the Apostle speaks, refer but to this, that God was manifest in the flesh? 2dly, Mr Porter has said much about the purity of GRIESBACH'S text; but, with respect to this passage, how did GRIESBACH act? He inserted Θεὸς in



his first edition; but in his second edition he acted in opposition to even *his own* authority (which we are required to follow), in addition to every other evidence, by the omission of  $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ , and the insertion of  $\delta\varsigma$ . Whether he acted correctly or not, may be easily ascertained from a comparison of the following summary of authorities for the two readings, *viz.*—

*Authorities for  $\delta\varsigma$ .*

MANUSCRIPTS.

Augian and Boernerian (F and G a single authority), *possibly*.  
Two small letter manuscripts (17 and 73), *certainly*.

VERSIONS.

None.

FATHERS.

Cyril Alexand., A.D. 412 in parte, *probably*.  
Epiphanius, A.D. 390, *probably*.  
Theodore Mopsuest., A.D. 400, *clearly*.  
Also some persons in the sixth century, as appears from a story told by Liberatus and Hinckmarus.

*Authorities for  $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ .*

MANUSCRIPTS.

Augian and Boernerian (F and G a single authority), *probably*.  
The Alexandrine and Ephrem (A and C), *almost certainly*.  
All collated small letter manuscripts of every class (except 17 and 73), *certainly*.

VERSIONS.

Arabic Polyg. and M. S. Slavonic, *certainly*.

FATHERS.

Ignatius, A.D. 100, Clemens Alexand., A.D. 194, and others, *probably*.  
Dionysius Alex., A.D. 264 (if genuine, as is probable), *pretty clearly*.  
Athanasius, A.D. 326 (if genuine, as is probable), *certainly*.  
Cyril Alex., A.D. 412, in parte, *probably*.  
Basil, . . . A.D. 370, *probably*.  
Gregory Nyssen, A.D. 370, *clearly*.  
Chrysostom, A.D. 386, do.  
Theodoret, . A.D. 423, do.  
Euthalius, . A.D. 462, do.  
Damascenus, A.D. 730, do.  
Epiphanius, A.D. 787, do.  
Photius, . . A.D. 858, do.  
Œcumenius, A.D. 900, do.  
Theophylact, A.D. 1077, do.

From a comparison, or rather a contrast, of these authorities, you will easily perceive which is the correct reading; whilst at the same time it is of very little consequence whether these disputed passages be kept out of sight or not in this controversy, as I have ample supply of other texts, whose genuineness and authenticity cannot be questioned.

I must now advert to a strange, and to me a sur-

prising admission, which Mr Porter yesterday made, in reference to *his* religious views. The admission was expressed in these words : “ *My views of the person of Christ are accompanied in Scripture with some difficult and perplexing circumstances to my own mind, which lead me to look upon those who differ from me with charity and candour.* ” What a noble sacrifice at the shrine of truth ! And in what, let me ask Mr Porter, do these difficulties and perplexities consist ? Is it not in this, that he is not able to resist the strong scriptural assertions of the deity of Christ, which the Scriptures contain ? For my part, I can see no perplexities in the views which I hold in reference to the personal glory of Christ. I can reconcile and connect all the statements of revelation, in consistency with the opinions I hold, as satisfactorily as a weak and finite intellect can ; and I am confident of this, that the Apostle Paul never made such an admission as this of Mr Porter’s. His language was, “ I know in whom I have believed ; ” and if Mr Porter would surrender his present views, and become a sincere believer in the true Deity of the Saviour, then, under the teaching of the Spirit, all these difficulties and perplexities under which he is now labouring would vanish and disappear.

Mr Porter next asserted, that the Evangelists, MATTHEW, MARK, and LUKE, never once assert the Deity of Christ ; and that JOHN is supposed to have done so only once, or perhaps twice. Now, let me suppose for a moment that this is correct, in order to show by a simple illustration how unserviceable such a fact would be to his argument. Suppose I had occasion to call on Mr Porter at his own house ; and, on having gone there, found that he was not in his parlour, or his drawing-room, or in his office ; would I be justified in leaving the house under the impression that he was not there, whilst he was at the very time occupied in his study ? Surely not. Now, vulgar and simple as this illustration may appear, it serves to detect the

fallacy of the remark which I wish to expose. The Bible is one compact structure of divine truth, reared by a *single* architect—the Spirit of God. It consists of different departments—namely, of the various books of which it is composed. Now, suppose I did not find the doctrine of the Saviour's Deity in MATTHEW, MARK, LUKE, or JOHN; or, in fact, in any one of these departments, except, for instance, the book of the REVELATION; would I be justified in rejecting that doctrine? Surely not. If I find this doctrine clearly revealed only in one book of Scripture, and even in one isolated passage of that book, I should consider myself bound to give it implicit assent, just as much as if it constituted the pervading and reiterated topic of revelation. And let me further ask: If I did not find this doctrine in the evangelical history, does Mr Porter mean that I should employ a kind of sponge, for the purpose of obliterating those statements of it which the Epistles contain? Surely not, if I regard the Bible as one compact volume written by a single author—namely, the Spirit of God. Further: Suppose the Evangelists did not once allude to the doctrine of the Deity of Christ, could I not have accounted for this omission—I argue upon the superadded supposition that this doctrine is contained in other parts of Scripture—upon principles which should have satisfied *our* finite judgments? The Evangelists professed to record the history of the days of the flesh and humiliation of the Son of man: might they not, then, without compromising their faithfulness as biographers, have adhered inflexibly to the subject they proposed; whilst the Holy Spirit, under whose guidance they wrote, reserved the revelation of the Saviour's Deity for some subsequent portion of his work? How would Mr Porter refute the infidel, who should argue that the Bible teaches atheism, because the name of Deity does not once occur in the book of Esther? And will he have the goodness to inform me, what precise amount of evidence will satisfy his judgment

in support of the true Deity of Christ? In the mean time, I hold it as an axiom, that we should be satisfied with that quantum of evidence which the Holy Spirit is pleased to impart. The Sadducees, who considered their written rule of faith to be comprised within the limits of the five books of Moses, were still under an obligation to believe in the doctrine of the resurrection, although there might have been no other evidence for it than what the language of God to Moses—"I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and of Jacob"—conveyed; in which that doctrine is only taught *inferentially*, and in which the argument that supports it rests upon the use of the verb "am;" which bears a reference to the *present*, in contrast to the *past* tense; suggesting the argument that as God *is* not the God of the dead but of the living, so, although the *bodies* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had long since been consigned to their original dust, yet as to their *souls*, they must have been alive in a state of glory *at the time when God said* in the language of encouragement to Moses, "I am their God." Here, then, is one instance of our being under obligation to believe a most important doctrine, although taught only by inference. Alas! alas! this feeling of dissatisfaction at the amount of evidence which it has pleased the Holy Spirit to give in support of the Deity of Christ, too much resembles the spirit of those who, when the Saviour hung upon the cross, surrounded by every symptom of dereliction and dismay, exclaimed, "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross and we will believe thee." But I now deny the position, that the Evangelists, MATTHEW, MARK, and LUKE, did not plainly assert the doctrine of the Deity of Christ; and this I am warranted to do, after the amount of evidence from their writings which I yesterday advanced.

I shall now proceed to make some remarks upon the passages of Scripture to which Mr Porter referred yesterday. I have already said, that when he threw

down his own building by the strange admission to which I have already alluded, he came over to my side, and kindly commenced to build my house, before I had commenced to do so myself. And this he did by quoting a number of passages which, as I shall show, are *positive* and *affirmative* proofs of the doctrines which I hold; for they prove my first proposition—I refer you to the printed rules—*directly and immediately*, and they establish my second proposition *indirectly and mediately*. This position I shall illustrate by an examination of the texts which he advanced—viz.

He first referred to DEUT. vi. 4, “Hear, O Israel! the Lord our God, is one Lord;” or “Jehovah, our Elohim, is one Jehovah.” This passage clearly proves my first proposition, which asserts, “There is one God Jehovah, who is God only, to the entire exclusion of the alleged Deity of every creature.” So that I feel indebted to Mr Porter for proving my side of the question for me. But this text *indirectly* supports my second proposition; for the words “our God,” or “our Elohim,” are in the plural number, which, I argue, is an indication of some sort of plurality being included in the nature of Deity. And if my doctrine, that Christ is “one God with the Father,” is correct, then this peculiar phraseology is at once accounted for.

He next referred to ISAIAH xxxvii. 16 and 20; verses which at once prove the doctrine of the unity of Jehovah: which constitutes my *first* proposition. But they also demonstrate *indirectly* my *second* proposition, relative to the true Deity of Christ: and this will be evident, when I show that the same divine titles and works, which in this passage are ascribed to Jehovah, are elsewhere ascribed to Christ; which I do by the following comparison, viz.—

ISAIAH xxxvii. 16, 20.

O Lord of hosts, God of Israel, that dwellest between the cherubim; thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth: thou hast made heaven and earth. . . . Now, therefore, O Lord our God, save us from his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou art the Lord, even thou only.

*Similar attributes ascribed to Christ.*

By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth.—COL. i. 16.

Thomas answered and said unto him, my Lord and my God.—JOHN xx. 28.

I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth.—REV. iii. 10.

The next passage which Mr Porter referred to was ZECH. xiv. 9, which also proves *my* first proposition directly, and my second indirectly; which will also be evident from the following comparison:—

ZECH. xiv. 9.

And the Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one.

*Similar attributes ascribed to Christ.*

All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.—MATT. xxviii. 18.

And from Jesus Christ, who is . . . the Prince of the kings of the earth.—REV. i. 5.

. . . And one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.—1 COR. viii. 6.

And as Mr Porter has laid some stress upon the latter clause of this passage, “his name shall be one,” I beg to remind him, that if he understands these words in a strictly literal sense, they contain as valid an objection against the Deity of the Father as of the Son.

He next referred to NEH. ix. 6, which also proves *my* first proposition directly, and my second indirectly; as will be evident from the following comparison, viz.:—

NEH. ix. 6.

Thou, even thou, art Lord alone: thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all things that are therein, and thou preservest them all; and all the host of heaven worshipeth thee.

*Similar declarations in reference to Christ.*

For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.—COL. i. 16, 17.

Upholding all things by the word of his power.—HEB. i. 3.

Let all the angels of God worship him.—HEB. i. 6.

He next adverted to MARK xii. 29, which also proves my first and second propositions in the same manner ; as will also appear from the following comparison :—

MARK xii. 29.

The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel ! the Lord our God is one Lord (Κύριος εἷς).

*A similar declaration made in reference to Christ.*

But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him ; and one Lord (εἷς Κύριος) Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.—1 COR. viii. 6.

He next adverted to GAL. iii. 20, “Now a mediator is not a mediator of one ; but God is one.” I merely allude to his quotation of this passage, in order to remark what a proof it affords of the superficial manner in which he must be in the habit of reading the Scriptures ; for who that understood the spirit of the Apostle’s reasoning in the context of this passage, would think of producing it as a proof of the simple unity of the divine nature ? I shall merely paraphrase this text, which will at once show how irrelevant it is to the subject of our discussion : “Now the very idea of mediation necessarily implies the existence of more parties than one ; but in the Christian scheme of mediation, the Divine Being is one of the parties concerned.”

I shall now direct my attention to those proofs which Mr Porter advanced in support of the Deity of the Father *exclusively*. I must request you, however, to remark attentively, that he is bound by the terms of his first proposition not merely to prove that the Father is the only true God, but that the *Father only* is the only true God. I repeat this remark as being of the first importance to our subject : he is bound not merely to prove the exclusive Deity of the Father, but the exclusive Deity of the *Father exclusively*. And it will appear evident, after an inspection of the arguments he has advanced, that he has completely



failed in making out his case as stated in his first proposition.

He first referred to MATT. xxiii. 9, "Call no man your Father upon the earth; for one is your Father which is in heaven." I reply, that the Father *personally* is not exclusively referred to here: the words "your Father," evidently mean your Creator; for any one who has read the Scriptures with ordinary attention must be aware that the title of Father is frequently given to the Divine Being in the sense of Creator, as in MAL. ii. 10, "Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?" And, in this sense I maintain that Christ is included in the designation of "Father" in this passage; for he is the Creator and Preserver of all things (COL. i. 16, 17); and, at the time when he pronounced these words, he was in heaven as to his divine nature, though in his human nature he was on the earth, for he says in JOHN iii. 13, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, *which is in heaven.*"

The next passage to which he referred, as a proof of the exclusive Deity of the Father, was MATT. x. 29, "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing, and one of them cannot fall to the ground without your Father." But here, also, the term Father is evidently used in the sense of preserver, as a designation of the Divine Being. Mr Porter, in the course of his remarks upon this text, challenged me to produce a similar declaration in reference to the Son: I readily accept the challenge, and shall refer him to a far stronger and more emphatic declaration of the providential superintendence of Christ, in which he is described as preserving, not merely two sparrows, but *all* created things; for "he upholds all things by the word of his power." HEB. i. 3.

The next passage to which Mr Porter referred was LUKE x. 21, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven

and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." This text distinctly proves the Deity of the Father ; for it ascribes to him the title of " Lord of heaven and earth"—represents him as the object of worship, and as the author of revelation. But in GAL. i. 12, the same divine work is ascribed to the Son, " For I neither received it (*i.e.*, the gospel) of man, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." So that, as the same divine work, which in LUKE x. 21 is ascribed to the Father, is in GAL. i. 12 ascribed to the Son, I infer that Father and Son are one God.

The next quotation was from 1 COR. viii. 4, 6, " As concerning, therefore, the eating of those things which are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one ; for though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many, and lords many) ; but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him ; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." Upon this passage, I beg to make the following remarks :—

(1.) The God of the Christian is here placed in direct and expressed contrast, not to a plurality of persons *in* his own nature, but to a plurality of false gods, whom the heathen worshipped.

(2.) The " one God," in ver. 6, is not placed in opposition to the Godship of Christ, who is elsewhere frequently styled God (as in ROM. ix. 5), any more than the expression " one Lord " is placed in opposition to the Lordship of the Father, who is elsewhere frequently styled Lord (as in MARK xii. 29). The Father and the Son are " one God," as the Son and the Father are " one Lord ;" or else there are *two Lords* and *two Gods*.

(3.) It is asserted of both the " one God," and the " one Lord," in this passage, that they are equally the

Creator and Preserver of all things : of the former it is said "of whom are all things, and we in him ;" and, of the latter, "by whom are all things, and we by him."

(4.) As the Apostle speaks of the objects of idolatrous worship under the *general* designation of "those that are called gods," and then subdivides them into two *species*, of "gods many, and lords many ;" it is evident that the "lords many" are, equally with the "gods many," included in the more general designation of those that are "called gods." But there is a perfect parallelism between the fifth and sixth verses, from which I infer that the "one Lord Jesus Christ" is, equally with the "one God the Father," included in the more general declaration at the commencement of the 6th verse, "But to us there is but one God."

(5.) The last remark is based upon the supposition that the "one God the Father" refers to the Father *personally* (or the first person of the Trinity) ; but I am rather disposed to think that the word "Father" is used in this passage in a more extended sense, as a general designation of the Divine Being, in the sense of Creator and Preserver of all things. And this I argue, from the *explanation* of the term which is immediately added, "the Father, *of whom are all things*." In this view, therefore, of the passage the "one God, the Father, of whom are all things," includes Christ in his divine nature, by whom all things were created, and by whom all things consist ; and the "one Lord, Jesus Christ," in that case, involves a reference to him in another capacity, as Mediator, and head over all things to his church.

(6.) Those who deny the Deity of Christ, and argue for the Deity of the Father *only*, are bound to account for the Apostle's *contrasting* the Lord Jesus Christ with the *false Deities* of the Heathen ; for why do so, unless he possessed *true Deity* ? On their principles, the persons contrasted with the gods many and lords

many of the Heathen, should have been the Father *only*; for why mention another person, if the Father *only* possessed true Deity?

(7.) This passage is valuable to my cause, as giving a meaning to the term  $\text{Κύριος}$ , so frequently applied to Christ. The Apostle undoubtedly uses  $\text{Κύριος}$  (in ver. 5) as a classification or species of  $\text{Θεός}$  in the preceding part of the verse.  $\text{Κύριος}$  (in English, Lord) implies dominion or authority, and is given to Christ about a thousand times in the New Testament. Throughout the Septuagint it is used as the translation of the Hebrew word יהוה (Jehovah.)  $\text{Κύριος}$  exactly corresponds with the Baalim of the Phœnicians. It is a word, however, which admits of great latitude in its application; but in this passage, as well as in others, we have plain evidence of its being applied to Christ in the highest sense, not merely from the reasons before stated, but also from the declaration, “by whom are all things,” being connected with it; for this phrase is used in ROM. xi. 36, and in HEB. ii. 10, to designate God as the *originating cause* of all things, as is evident from a reference to the original of the three passages, in all of which the same preposition,  $\text{δια}$ , occurs.

The next passage to which Mr Porter alluded was 1 TIM. ii. 5, “There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” Upon this text I remark, that the former clause proves *my* first proposition, and the latter clause proves that part of my second proposition which asserts that Christ is Mediator; but it has no reference to “his highest capacity, nature, or condition;” for it contains internal evidence of its referring to him in reference to his *official* person. But why should Mr Porter have quoted this text, unless he acknowledges himself to be a Humanitarian? for it says nothing of Christ as an angelic or superangelic being, but simply speaks of him as “the man Christ Jesus.”

Mr Porter then referred to MARK xiii. 32, "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven; neither the Son, but the Father." I shall, however, decline replying to his argument from this text, until he shall answer a question which I shall propose to him; for I wish to imitate the plan which our Saviour adopted in order to meet the captious questions which were proposed to him in the days of his flesh. The question I propose to him is this, How does he reconcile with the omniscience of the Father the declaration, in reference to Christ, contained in REV. xix. 12, "He had a name written that no man (or, in the Greek, no one, οὐδείς) knew, but he himself?" Here, it is expressly asserted, that no one knew the name which Christ bore, but Christ himself. Now, I should be glad to know how Mr Porter will reconcile this strong declaration with the omniscience of the Father. I leave the question with him, in order to obtain from him a solution of the difficulty it presents; and as soon as he shall give it, I shall then reconcile the declaration contained in MARK. xiii. 32, with the omniscience of the Son.

I find that my time is nearly expired. I call upon Mr Porter, then, to state distinctly and explicitly to this meeting, what are his *positive* and *affirmative* views in reference to the person of Christ; I call upon him to state, whether he considers him to be a mere man, or an angelic or superangelic being manifested in a human form; I call upon him to state to what precise grade and classification of created beings he considers him to belong; and I call upon him to give his direct and positive arguments for what he has asserted in his second proposition, that Christ, in his highest capacity, nature, or condition, *is a created being*. I again call upon Mr Porter to produce the text or texts in which he considers that Christ is, in reference to his highest capacity, nature, or condition, designated *a creature*.

MR PORTER.—Mr Bagot has spoken of the support which I have lent to the first of his propositions, which is, that “*There is one God, Jehovah, who is God only, to the entire exclusion of the alleged god-head of every creature.*” I now beg leave to ask him—as, by the regulations of this Discussion, I am authorised to do—what he understands by the “ONE GOD, JEHOVAH, *who is God only?*” Does he mean, *God the Father?*” or does he mean, “*God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?*”

MR BAGOT.—I mean to express by the term Jehovah, as used in my first proposition, precisely *the* Jehovah who is revealed to us in the Bible.

MR PORTER.—My friends, you will be able, from the answer I have just received to a plain and simple question put to Mr Bagot—a question which, as a scholar and a clergyman, he ought to be able to answer without doubt, hesitation, or difficulty—a question, however, to which he gave no answer at all; for he explained nothing—he defined nothing; but left the subject exactly as it stood before the question was put;—you will be able, I say, to judge from the answer which he gave to a plain question, whether the charge which I yesterday advanced against him, of shrinking from the defence of the Trinity, be correct or not. I say, that in that answer, he shrunk again from the avowal of his principles as a Trinitarian; and, like the persons of whom the poet speaks, “he paltered with us in a double sense.”

“ He kept the word of promise to the ear,  
But broke it to our hope ! ”

For my own part, I should be ashamed of myself, and of the situation which I occupy in the Church of Christ, and I should blush for those persons who have put me into the station which I hold, if I were capable of giving an answer such as that given in reply to my question concerning the person of the Deity who is

the object of my worship. You will be able to judge, from the specimen now presented, whether it is Mr Bagot or myself that speaks openly, plainly, directly, and intelligibly ! You will be able to judge which of us advocates those principles which dread not investigation. You will be able to judge which of us advocates a cause that is plain and intelligible—a cause such that the more it is examined, the more clearly its beauty and its excellence are seen ; and the more its evidences are weighed, the more convincing, palpable, and satisfactory they appear.

I shall now take notice of some remarks which Mr Bagot has made upon my address of yesterday ; and I must express my regret that, as a foundation for those remarks, he has adduced expressions, and attributed them to me, which I never used—which I absolutely disclaim—which, in the presence of upwards of two hundred witnesses, I absolutely disavow. He attributed to me expressions which, had I really uttered them, would have proved me to be equally destitute of integrity and discretion, both as a minister and as a man. He attributed to me the expression, that the original Scriptures are mutilated, interpolated, and grossly corrupted. I never made use of any such expression ! I said that the copy of the original from which King James's version was made, was mutilated, interpolated, and grossly corrupted. I say this again, and can prove it : but to say that the original Scriptures are so, is a thing of which I never dreamed ; and the reason is, that I consider the original from which King James's version was executed, so far as it was mutilated and interpolated, is not Scripture, but a gross imposture foisted in upon us in the place of Scripture.

But it well becomes Mr Bagot to stand up for the perfect integrity of the text from which King James's translation was made. He knows how to turn its defects to good account. He did not think it beneath



him to bring forward, in support of the statement of his doctrine, a text to which every word that I uttered is applicable ; I mean 1 JOHN v. 7. Let Mr Bagot, after this, talk about the mutilation, interpolation, and corruption of the Scriptures, as he pleases ; but, depend upon it, the less he says upon the subject the better for himself.

You will remember the exclamation of Mr Bagot, when he asked, "What sort of faith must that man have who describes the original of the Scriptures as mutilated, interpolated, and grossly corrupted !" I can only say,—if the question refers to me,—mine is not the faith which would induce me to attribute to another, expressions which were never used ! Mine is not the faith which would induce me to quote, as an authority, a gross interpolation of Sacred Scripture ! Mine is not the faith which depends on secrecy and silence, when a declaration is required respecting an important doctrine !

I might now proceed to analyse those quibbling arguments and petty sophisms to which Mr Bagot has had recourse in order to obviate the plain meaning of those strong texts which I yesterday advanced. I put it to you, as persons of intelligence and education,—as may be presumed from the station in life which you appear to occupy ;—I put it to you as persons whose presence here shows that you are in some degree concerned for the progress of religious truth ;—I put it to you, as persons who frequent those places in which the word of God is dispensed, and who are in the habit of reading those works in which statements in support of peculiar doctrines are brought forward ;—I put it to you all, if you ever heard of a specimen of sophistry so perfect as that just afforded by Mr Bagot's comment on 1 Cor. viii. 6. I never, in all my life, witnessed such *paring down* of Scripture, or such quibbling, in order to get rid of the plain meaning of a plain text.

To follow Mr Bagot in all his quotations and ex-

planations would occupy a considerable portion of that time which, in justice to my cause, I feel bound to employ in setting forth the direct testimony in its favour. I will not, then, be led away by Mr Bagot. I will not follow him in all the wanderings of his tortuous labyrinth. I will go on in the path of Scripture ; that plain road, in which the wayfaring man, though a fool, cannot err.

Mr Bagot has paid me some compliments for the pains I have taken in proving for him his first proposition. I accept them willingly. I feel that I have deserved them. I did take some pains to prove his first proposition. And why ? Just because his first proposition is also mine ! Just because it is plain and simple Unitarianism !—I shall now proceed to strengthen it by other proofs ; and I shall first adduce some

TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE, DIRECTLY PROVING THE UNITY OF GOD, TO THE EXPRESS EXCLUSION OF ALL OTHER PERSONS AND BEINGS.

These I shall state in such a manner, that, if you have your Bibles here, as you ought to have, and as I hope you have, you will be able to follow me in my references, and to judge whether the conclusions which I draw are well founded or not. In this, I am not *exactly* following Mr Bagot's example : but I prefer taking my own course. I refer you, then, to—

EXOD. ix. 14. I will at this time send all my plagues upon thine heart, and upon thy servants, and upon thy people ; that thou mayest know THERE IS NONE LIKE ME in all the earth.

And if there be none in all the earth, then is there none in all the universe, like unto Jehovah. Again,—

EXOD. xv. 11. Who is like unto thee, O Lord (Jehovah), among the gods ? WHO IS LIKE THEE, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders ?

There are that are called gods, in an inferior sense ; but Moses and the children of Israel ask, Who is, as

Jehovah is, in the highest and all-perfect sense, "glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?"

DEUT. iii. 24. O LORD God, . . . what god is there in heaven or in earth that can do according to thy works?

The word LORD is, in the original, Jehovah. The words which I have omitted will be found not to be necessary to the connection in reference to this subject.

PSALM lxxxix. 6. Who in the heavens can be compared unto the LORD? who among the sons of the mighty can be likened unto the LORD? . . . 8. O LORD God of hosts, who is a strong LORD like unto thee, or to thy faithfulness round about thee?

This particularity may appear tedious; but it is necessary, in order to do justice to my cause, not only that I should bring before you some plain texts, but that I should show that the Scriptures abound with them. It is on the quantity, as well as the directness of the testimony that I rely; the force of which cannot be done away with by any wire-drawn deductions, or fine-spun inferences. I do not deal in such arguments. I am supporting plain doctrines by plain texts.

My next class of proofs consists of—

PASSAGES WHICH EVINCE THAT THE FATHER IS THE ONE BEING WHO IS ASSERTED TO BE GOD ALONE, TO THE EXCLUSION OF ALL OTHERS.

I turn to—

JER. xxxi. 7. Thus saith the LORD, . . . 9. I am a FATHER to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born.

MAL. ii. 10. Have we not all one FATHER? hath not ONE GOD created us?

JOHN viii. 41. We are not born of fornication. We have ONE Father, even God.

I bring this passage forward to prove that the Jewish people considered the Father to be the only true Deity—an idea which Christ himself never corrected.

Where, I ask, did our Lord, in his public teaching, correct the impression, if erroneous? and why, if it were erroneous, did he sanction the mistake? The words of the Jews to our Lord were, as we have seen, "*We are not born of fornication: we have One Father, even God.*" Christ, as I have stated, never contradicted the opinion of the Jewish people. On the contrary, in that beautiful address, commonly called the Sermon on the Mount, as contained in the 5th, 6th, and 7th chapters of MATTHEW'S Gospel, he says, as a motive to the forgiveness of injuries,—

MATT. v. 45. That ye may be the children of your FATHER who is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and upon the unjust.

Another proof that our Saviour represented the Father alone as the true God, occurs in the same address, as recorded in—

MATT. vi. 26. Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet YOUR HEAVENLY FATHER feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? . . . 28. And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field how they grow. . . . Wherefore, if GOD so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, will he not much more clothe you?

Here, again, he identifies the term, GOD and FATHER; intimating, clearly, that they express exactly the same thing, and are coextensive in signification:—

LUKE xii. 30-32. These things do the nations of the world seek after, and your FATHER knoweth that ye have need of these things. But seek ye the kingdom of GOD, and all these things shall be added unto you. Fear not, little flock; for it is your FATHER'S good pleasure to give you the kingdom.

Observe, again, the manner in which the two terms GOD and FATHER are used as interchangeable, and as having precisely the same meaning. I am endeavouring, on purpose, to read these texts as slowly as I can. I have nothing to hope from concealment; nor am I

desirous of running away from you, from my opponent, or from my argument. Look again to—

JOHN iv. 23, 24. The true worshippers shall worship the FATHER in spirit and in truth ; for the FATHER seeketh such to worship him. GOD is a spirit ; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.

It vexeth me to know, but such is the perversity of the human mind that, in despite of the plainest declarations of Christ himself, contained in the word of God, the vast majority of his professing followers continue to offer up adoration to beings whose worship he never sanctioned, in direct violation of his own positive and repeated mandates. I find nowhere in Scripture the worship of “ *God the Son, Redeemer of the world.*” I find nowhere in Scripture that I am to worship “ *God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son.*” I find nowhere in Scripture directions to worship what is called the “ *Holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three persons, and One God !*” But I find plain and repeated injunctions to worship ONE GOD AND FATHER OF ALL ; and not least plain in the passage to which I now refer. Others may worship those whom they may think worthy of adoration ; but “ the true worshippers shall worship THE FATHER in spirit and in truth ; for such THE FATHER seeketh to worship him.”

JOHN vi. 45, 46. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all *taught* of GOD. Every man therefore that hath *heard* and *learned* of THE FATHER, cometh unto me. Not that any man hath seen THE FATHER, save he who is of GOD ; he hath seen THE FATHER.

This quotation proves that our Lord applies the term *God* and *Father* indiscriminately, to express exactly the same idea ; and that, in his language, the two nouns are perfectly coextensive. And this is also intimated by the Apostle James in—

JAMES i. 27. Pure religion and undefiled, before GOD, even THE FATHER, is this ; and also in JAMES i. 17, Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from THE

FATHER OF LIGHTS, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.

Mr Bagot, I hope, is satisfied with the farther aid which I am lending him to establish his first proposition. I venture to affirm that I have placed it on an immovable basis, whence he himself, with all his quibbles, and all his sophistry, will not be able to shake it down!

I shall now direct you to some—

PASSAGES WHEREIN THE ONE GOD IS EXPRESSLY DISTINGUISHED FROM OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, IN SUCH A MANNER THAT THE ALLEGED DEITY OF THE LATTER IS ENTIRELY EXCLUDED.

I yesterday quoted MARK x. 18, and 1 TIM. ii. 5, with some other texts, in support of this position. I shall now give you a few more passages, which doubtless Mr Bagot will find *as much to his purpose* as those already referred to.

MATT. xxiv. 36. Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but MY FATHER *only*.

The phrase "*my Father only*"—showing that the person to whom the knowledge of the day alluded to was confined, was *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*—would, of itself, be sufficient to establish his exclusion from that knowledge, and consequently from deity. But, to make assurance doubly sure, we read in the parallel passage :—

MARK xiii. 32. Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, BUT THE FATHER!

Great, then, was the knowledge vouchsafed to Christ for the purposes of Divine Providence; and abundantly as he was qualified for the objects of his mission, by the wisdom, and the grace which were bestowed upon him, there were, it appears, some things which

he did not know ; as he elsewhere expressly says, there were some things which he could not do. Whether this deficiency in wisdom and power is consistent with his supposed proper deity I leave it to the judgment of candid minds to determine. I put it to every one of you—I put it to every honest and unprejudiced understanding, that is capable of forming an opinion on the subject—whether this deficiency in knowledge be not *proved* by the passage in MARK xiii. 32.

It is of no consequence whether the day here spoken of be the day of judgment, or that of his coming to destroy Jerusalem. It is no matter what the particular day and hour may have been ; Christ says there was a *day and an hour* of which he was ignorant. The inference against his proper deity is plain and obvious.

This text has long puzzled the assertors of the doctrine of the “Proper Deity of the Word ;” and many have been the quibbles, and many the sophisms, and abundant the wire-drawn deductions, to which they have had recourse, in order to evade the force of this plain declaration. Some have told us that our Lord spoke these words, not in his divine but in his human nature ; and that the time of this event, though unknown to him as man, was perfectly well known to him as God. Other Trinitarians—among whom is Dr WARDLAW—have perceived that this supposition is perfectly inconsistent with the language of Christ himself—who does not once allude to any distinction between his divine and human nature ; but, as reported by MATTHEW, uses the phrase, “the Father *only*,” which tacitly excludes himself from the knowledge, as the words in MARK do expressly—and who positively confines the possession of it solely to the Father. How, then, does Dr WARDLAW get over the difficulty ? He says that Christ, as God, knew the time (as undoubtedly he must have known it if he were really God), but that he was ignorant of it in his media-



torial capacity—that is to say, it was not one of those things which, as Mediator, he was commissioned to teach. Let us see how this criticism applies to the text. “Of that day and that hour knoweth no man,” says our Saviour; that is to say, according to this hypothesis, *no man has been commissioned to reveal it.* “No,” adds our Lord, “not the angels which are in heaven;” that is, the angels have not been commissioned to teach it. “Neither the Son,” continues our Saviour; which means that *the Son has not been commissioned to reveal it.* “But THE FATHER,” which, on the explanation of Dr WARDLAW, can only mean that THE FATHER HAS BEEN *commissioned* to declare that day! And by whom was he commissioned? Who gave his commission to the Father of all? Let this question be answered. But it will not; for it cannot! Others again tell us that the word “know” is to be taken in a peculiar sense—that it means “to make known.” Let us try this explanation also, “Of that day and hour knoweth no man;” that is, no man *maketh it known*; no, nor do “the angels in heaven” make it known; nor does “the Son” make it known; “but the Father” makes it known. And where has he given any information on the subject? Let that question be answered. It will not; for it cannot! Besides, as Professor STUART, of Andover, observes, although the verb γινώσκω sometimes has the signification of *declaring* as well as of *knowing*; yet, in this passage, the verb is εἶδεν, a derivative from εἶδω, a distinct verb, which never occurs in this sense. Now, Mr STUART is professor in a Calvinistic seminary, and his tract on the deity of Christ was republished in this town in 1825, so that it can readily be determined whether I am correct or not in the statement of his opinion. To state these quibbles is to refute them.

The last passage which I shall adduce on this occasion, is—

ACTS iv. 24. And when they [the Apostles] heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said: Lord, thou art God! . . . 29. And now, Lord, . . . grant . . . 30. that signs and wonders may be done by the name of *thy holy child Jesus*.

The God to whom they prayed was the being, of whom Jesus was *the holy child*; that is to say, GOD THE FATHER.

I have now but a short time unexpired, and I shall employ it to make one remark upon an allusion of Mr Bagot's, which I intended to notice before this; but my mind being more occupied with the language of Scripture than with his, it escaped my memory at the time. He asked, "How can I reconcile it to my conscience, to employ and read in public worship, a version of the Scriptures, which" not "I" alone, but also Bishop LOWTH and Dr J. PYE SMITH, have stated, "abounds with gross and numberless errors?" To this question I answer that, when any of those errors occur in the course of the lessons which I read, I correct them as I go on. I cannot help thanking Mr Bagot for his allusion to the situation which I hold as minister of a church in which I am not fettered by any ecclesiastical regulations, to prevent me from using any version that I may prefer, or making any alterations in it that may be necessary, in order to make the translation agree with the divine original. This was a most unfortunate allusion for Mr Bagot; for it reminds us that he belongs to a Church, according to whose rules he must not presume to refuse to read the version which is enjoined by superior authority, no matter what may be his opinion of its merit. Though it appear to his own mind ever so mistaken—though it be, in fact, ever so erroneous—he must not take it upon him to alter one word. *Litera scripta manet!* He must read it!

---

MR BAGOT.—Before I proceed with my regular course of argument, I am anxious, with feelings of the purest courtesy and kindness, to make a remark in reference to some expressions which Mr Porter has repeatedly used since the commencement of this discussion. He has been pleased to designate my arguments as wire-drawn quibbles and petty sophistries : I beg simply to state to Mr Porter and to this meeting that I, at least, do not hold his intellectual powers in such supreme contempt as to describe the arguments which he has advanced by the epithets of “wire-drawn quibbles and petty sophistries.”

Mr Porter has found fault with the observations which I felt it my duty to make in reference to the terms in which he described the original manuscripts of Scripture. He has told you that he only alluded to MSS. from which King James’s translation was made, and not to the original of Scripture itself. *But are not this audience aware that Mr Porter has not the original of Scripture within his reach?* that the autographs of the sacred writers are in the possession of none ; and that we must, therefore, be satisfied with the best copy which we can obtain, by a careful revision and collation of the several manuscripts to which we have access ? And Mr Porter has failed to prove that the original, from which King James’s translation was made, “was mutilated, interpolated, and otherwise grossly corrupted.”

My commentary and remarks upon 1 Cor. viii. 4-6. have been met by a *vague* and general assertion, that I have been dealing in petty sophistries and quibbles. Let Mr Porter substantiate the correctness of what he asserts.

Before I proceed further, I wish to produce a few more proofs in support of my first proposition, which says, “There is one God, Jehovah, who is God alone, to the entire exclusion of the alleged godhead of every creature.” These additional proofs you will find in

EXOD. ix. 14; xv. 11; DEUT. iii. 24; PSALM lxxxix. 6, 8; MAL. ii. 10; JOHN viii. 41. In his remarks upon this last passage, Mr Porter argued that the Jews considered the Father *exclusively* to be the true God; and inferred the correctness of their views from the fact that Christ never reproved them as guilty of a misapprehension in this particular. Now, in reply to this, I beg to say that I would just as soon rely upon the authority of Mr Porter as upon the authority of the Jews; for, in fact, it is of no consequence to either side of the argument whether the Jews recognised the deity of Christ or not; because, as they did not recognise his Messiahship, such a principle of reasoning would prove more than Mr Porter would be willing to allow; it would go the length of proving that he was not the promised Messiah. And as to the assertion that Christ *never* corrected the erroneous views which his countrymen according to the flesh entertained of his person, it is not borne out by fact; as the Saviour did, on many occasions, give plain *intimations* of the divinity of his person. He did not, indeed, in plain and unqualified terms, declare, in so many words, that he was "the God of heaven and earth;" but he supplied the premises from which an intelligent mind could draw the conclusion that, whilst he was perfect man he was also perfect God. He did not, I say, on all occasions *openly* and *publicly* appear in the streets of Jerusalem, proclaiming himself in the presence of the Jews as the God of heaven and earth. He knew that there were many things which he had to communicate to the people which they could not yet bear. He knew that his *chief* employment, whilst upon earth, was to glorify the Father, and that, when he had completed that work, the Father would send the Spirit to glorify his Son; and, accordingly, we find the Spirit glorifying Christ as divine, by inspiring Paul to declare that he is over all, blessed for evermore; that by him

all things were created that are in heaven and that are in earth, and that by him all things consist ; and by testifying, as the beloved Apostle declared, that he is “ the true God and eternal life ;” and by several other declarations of the Saviour’s Deity, which I advanced in argument yesterday, and to which Mr Porter has not, in a single instance, replied. And do you ask the reason why Christ did not thus directly announce his Deity ? The answer is easy. To do so would have frustrated the grand object of his mission ; for, “ had his countrymen known him, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.” But it was arranged in the councils of heaven, before the sun disclosed by his newborn splendour the loveliness and beauty of this terrestrial creation, that the Saviour *should be delivered*, by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, into wicked hands to be crucified and slain ; that thereby he might make his soul an offering for sin, his body a sacrifice for transgression, in order that, by virtue of such an atonement, God might display himself to the intelligent creation as just, and as the justifier of the ungodly that believeth in Jesus.

You will find another proof of *my* first proposition in MATT. vi. 26, 28, and 30. I wish to make a remark upon the principle of reasoning which Mr Porter applied to this passage of Scripture. He compared the 26th verse, in which it said that the “ *Father* feedeth the fowls of the air ” with the 30th verse, in which the same work of providence is attributed to “ *God* ;” and from a comparison of the two he inferred the Deity of the Father. Now, Mr Porter’s use of this principle recognises and sanctions my mode of reasoning yesterday in proving the Deity of the Son. I quoted many passages in which divine works and prerogatives are ascribed to *God*, and compared them with others in which the very same divine works and prerogatives are ascribed to *Christ*, and thence inferred the true

Deity of Christ ; and I have now the judgment of Mr Porter, giving a clear decision in favour of the legitimacy of this plan of reasoning.

Mr Porter advanced LUKE x. 21, as a proof of the true Deity of the Father. I again say, that I fully admit the validity of his reasoning from this and other passages, which he has quoted as proofs of the Deity of the Father. For do you suppose that it is necessary for me to deny the Deity of the Father, as preliminary and preparatory to proving the Deity of the Son ? I assume and hold the Deity of the Father : it still remains with Mr Porter to advance his proofs that the Father *exclusively* is God.

The next passage to which he referred was JOHN iv. 23, 24 : "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth : for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit : and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." In the course of his remarks upon this passage, Mr Porter asked if I could produce a similar declaration in reference to the Son. I answer at once, that I will produce a passage which, upon his principles, is of infinitely higher authority. He believes that Christ is a *created* being, however high he may regard him in capacity, nature, or knowledge ; and that the Father exclusively is the one uncreated God : in his estimation, therefore, the authority of the Father must be *infinitely* more binding than that of the Son, who speaks, in the above announcement, to the woman of Samaria ; but the Father has recorded his inviolable command in reference to the Son in HEB. i. 6, "Let all the angels of God worship him" (προσκυνήσάτωσαν αὐτῷ). In reply to Mr Porter's additional remarks upon this passage, I beg to remind him that Christ does not say that the "true worshippers shall worship the Father *only*." The word "only" does not occur in the passage. In fact, this text defines *part* of the Christian doctrine in reference to Christian

worship, *but not all*; and Mr Porter, by supposing that it does reveal the *whole* mind of the Spirit in reference to the object of worship, casts, by anticipation, a charge of idolatry upon the dying prayer of Stephen, which he offered up when full of the Holy Ghost; and upon the conduct of Paul, in thrice praying to Christ, as recorded in 2 COR. xii. 8. He even casts an imputation of teaching idolatry against the Father himself when he said, "Let all the angels of God worship the Son;" and he stamps the impress of blasphemous idolatry upon the very angels themselves; for they are represented in Scripture as worshipping Christ; as is evident from ISA. vi. 1-3, compared with JOHN xii. 41, which proves that the Prophet spoke of Christ: and if any more proof be desired, I refer to REV. v. 14, where the four-and-twenty elders are represented as worshipping God and the Lamb.

Mr Porter next referred to JOHN vi. 45, 46, and argued that because the terms "God" and "Father" are indifferently used to express the same person in these two verses, that, therefore, the Father is God. I admit at once the conclusiveness of the reasoning as proving the Deity of the Father.

Mr Porter next advanced some passages, in which he asserted, that God the Father was spoken of so *distinctly* from Christ, as necessarily to prove the Deity of the Father exclusively, and to contradict altogether the Deity of the Son. Now, in reply to this argument, I shall advance some texts in which the Father is spoken of *so distinctly* from God, as, if this principle of reasoning were valid, would prove that the Father is not God. For instance, in GAL. i. 4, we read, "according to the will of God *and* our Father" (τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν); in PHIL. iv. 20, "Now unto God *and* our Father" (τῷ δὲ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ ἡμῶν); in COL. iii. 17, "Giving thanks to God *and* the Father" (εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ); in 1 THESS. i. 3, "In the sight of God *and* our Father" (ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ



Πατρὸς ἡμῶν) ; in 1 THESS. iii. 11, “Now God himself *and* our Father” (αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ ἡμῶν) ; and in JAMES i. 27, “Before God *and* the Father” (πρὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς). Now, in each of these instances, and in many others, the Father is spoken of so distinctly in the phraseology of each passage, from the word “God,” as would, upon Mr Porter’s principle of reasoning, prove that the Father is not God ; but I merely advance these examples, to illustrate the futility of the principles upon which he has been reasoning, and in order to have the opportunity of making this general remark,—*that I can produce arguments against the Deity of the Father, equally plausible with those which he advances against the Deity of the Son.*

Mr Porter has said a great deal about Christ’s not knowing the day of judgment, and has expended a considerable portion of his time in commenting upon the interpretations which Dr WARDLAW and Mr STUART of Andover have given of Mark xiii. 32 ; but I consider all that he said as totally irrelevant, *as he was impugning explanations which I never advanced.* One would suppose that Mr Porter came here to argue with Dr WARDLAW and Mr STUART, not with me. What have I to do with Dr WARDLAW’s interpretation ? He is not my bishop, nor am I bound to identify my judgment with his. If, however, Mr Porter wishes for a few months’ occupation when this discussion is over, let him sit down and write an answer to Dr WARDLAW’s Sermons on the Doctrine of the Trinity, or to Mr STUART’s work, to which he has also alluded. As neither Mr STUART’s work on the Deity of Christ, nor Dr WARDLAW’s last edition, have as yet been answered, it might be worth his while to prepare a reply to them. I now, however, declare that I will not advance any interpretation of MARK xiii. 32, until Mr Porter shall have explained for me REV. xix. 12, which asserts that Christ “had a name written, which no one (οὐδεὶς) knew but he himself.” What I wish

to know is, how will he reconcile this declaration with the omniscience of the Father? As soon as he will give me a satisfactory solution of this difficulty, I shall then reply to the argument which he has advanced against the omniscience of the Son from MARK xiii. 32, in which it is said, "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." As to Dr WARDLAW's and Mr STUART's interpretations of this passage, I reject them both. This declaration may be considered presumption on my part, but I cannot help it. I would give a different one, and will do so as soon as Mr Porter shall answer my question in reference to the text in REV. xix. 12.

Mr Porter next quoted ACTS iv. 24 and 27, in order to prove the Deity of the Father. The passage reads thus: "And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is. . . . For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together." His argument upon this passage was this, that since Christ is here styled the Holy Child of God, his *Father* must necessarily be God. I feel much obliged to him for this argument, and for the principle upon which it is based, and will apply it to a passage which you will find in LUKE i. 35, in which the angel is represented as saying to Mary, "*The Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: *therefore* also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called *the Son of God*." In this passage the Holy Ghost is represented as the Father of the Son of God; therefore, the Holy Ghost is God; and, therefore, Mr Porter has supplied me with an argument for the Deity of the Holy Ghost.

In the course of his last speech, Mr Porter informed

us that whenever he rises in this meeting-house to read the Scriptures, he always directs the attention of his hearers to any errors in the common translation, and explains the passages in which they occur, according to the original. I would beg, then, to ask him, does he correct the mistranslation which occurs in the latter clause of JOHN v. 19, "For what things soever the Father doeth, these doeth the Son likewise"? Does he inform his congregation that the word "these" should more correctly be rendered "the same," and that thereby the identity of operation between the Father and Son would be stated in more express and emphatic terms, if this correction were introduced into the English text? I would also beg to ask, when he reads the passage in HEB. i. 3, in which Christ is described as "upholding all things by the word of his power," does he correct the mistranslation in this text by stating that the word "*his*" should be translated "*his own*," so that this passage represents Christ as "upholding all things by the word of *his own* power," thereby contradicting the notion that Christ was only invested with a *derived* and *delegated* ability? And if it is here asserted that Christ "upholds *all* things by the word of *his own* power," I would like Mr Porter to exert his intellectual powers of calculation, in order to ascertain the height and depth, and length and breadth of that Almighty power which can and does uphold *all* things? Could a finite power uphold all things? Surely not. I ask, then, does Mr Porter correct this mistranslation, and tell his congregation that Christ upholds all things by the word of *his own* power? And I would here add, that I read this passage according to GRIESBACH'S received text, which we have both admitted, as you will see by referring to the printed definition of the standard.

As I do not wish to leave any argument of Mr Porter's unanswered, I shall now revert to his speech of yesterday, in which he quoted EPH. iv. 5, 6, in order

to prove the exclusive Deity of the Father *exclusively*. The passage is as follows: "There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Upon this passage I beg to make the following remarks:—

1. The term "Father" is here used, not to designate merely *the* Father personally, but as a general title of the Supreme Being, whether subsisting in one or in three persons. And to prove this I do not require the advantage of a *petitio principii*; for the words which stand in connection with the word "Father" clearly show that this is its import in the passage; "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

2. Even admitting that the term "Father," in this text, is to be understood of *the* Father personally, still I argue that the expression "one God," which precedes it, cannot exclude or contradict the Deity of the Son; or else, on the same principle, the expression "one Spirit" in the 4th verse, and "one Lord" in the 5th verse, would exclude the Father from being either "Lord" or "Spirit," though he is elsewhere in Scripture designated by both of these titles. So that Mr Porter's plan of arguing from the use of the exclusive term "one," as contradicting the inclusion of the Son in the Godhead, must at the same time overturn the Lordship and dominion of the Father; and, if applied in *both* cases, will go far to represent the Bible as a system of Atheism.

3. Admitting, also, that the expressions "one God and Father of all" refer to *the* Father personally, yet we find that every attribute which, in that view of the passage, is ascribed to the Father, is *elsewhere ascribed to the Son*; as, in JOHN iii. 31, it is said of Christ, "He that cometh from above, *is above all*;" in ROM. ix. 5, he is styled "*God over all*, blessed for evermore;" in COL. i. 17, it is asserted, that "*by him all*

*things consist;*" and, in HEB. i. 3, that he "upholds all things by the word of his own power."

Another passage adduced by Mr Porter yesterday, in opposition to the Deity of Christ, occurs in MATT. xix. 16, 17, "And behold, one came, and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God." Now, in reply to his arguments from this passage, I beg to remark that, in reading it, we should lay the emphasis on the word "why," and not on the word "me;" for the object of Christ was to ascertain what views the young man entertained of his person and character; and for this reason he proposed the question, "*Why* callest thou me good?" &c. And, in fact, there is no denial of his Deity here, on the part of Christ, unless an ellipsis be inserted in the text, so as to read it thus: "Why callest thou me good? *I am not good*, there is none good but one, that is God;" or thus: "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God, *and I am not God*." But I do not want to *add* to the Word of God. I am satisfied with that revelation which God has imparted, and which is all that now remains of his ancient converse with man. I am satisfied to rest my faith upon that Book, the origin of which I do not attribute to the unaided intellects of prophets, evangelists, and apostles, but which I believe to be one compact composition, which has God for its author, truth for its subject matter, and the salvation of man for its great and sublime consummation; a salvation which it was not unworthy of the Deity to stoop to accomplish. The object of Christ, then, in proposing this question was, as I said, to ascertain what views the inquirer held regarding him; whether he really believed that he was entitled to the designation "good," or whether the young man had accosted him merely in the language of flattery and compliment, with which the

Jews in general were accustomed to address the doctors of the law. But this passage is alleged to prove that Christ is not God. As well might we argue that, when Christ proposes the question, "If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son," it was the Saviour's object to disclaim the appellation of "David's Lord" (for both these passages begin with the same interrogatory form), whilst the Scriptures assert that he is the root and offspring of David.

But as I have referred to the declaration of Christ, "I am the *root* and *offspring* of David," I would wish to know how a created being could be the "*root*" from which David sprung? and how, at the same time, he could be the "*offspring*" which sprung from David? Surely Christ must have been the *root* of David by virtue of his *Godhead*, by which he gave birth not merely to David, but to all that walk upon the surface of the earth; and he must have been the *offspring* of David, by virtue of that *humanity* which he assumed in order to enable him to make his soul an offering for sin.

Mr Porter also referred to JOHN xvii. 3, as a proof of the exclusive Deity of the Father exclusively; "And this is life eternal, that they may know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." In reply to his argument from this passage, I make the following remarks:—

1. God is frequently styled the "true God," in opposition to gods falsely so called (as in 1 CHRON. xv. 3, 8; JER. x. 10; 1 THES. i. 9); and as the Father is God, he is of course the true God, and the only true God; *for surely Mr Porter does not ask me to deny the true Deity of the Father, as a preliminary to proving the Deity of the Son.* That, indeed, would be curious logic.

2. It is manifest also, from the construction of the passage, that the Father is called "God," not in opposition to a plurality of *persons*, but in opposition to

a plurality of *gods*, for the words are not σε μόνον τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν (thee only the true God), but σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν (thee the only true God), the exclusive particle μόνον (only) not being connected with the word σε (thee), but with the adjective ἀληθινὸν (true); which construction shows that the Deity of the Father is the “only true” Deity, just as I believe that the Deity of the Son is the “only true” Deity, for he is the true God and eternal life; 1 JOHN v. 20.

3. The Son is not distinguished from the Father, in this passage, in reference to his higher nature, but in reference to his *mediatorial* office, as is evident from the structure of the sentence: “Jesus Christ, *whom thou hast sent* ;” and also from this, that this passage is part of a prayer which Christ offered up as the *High Priest* of our profession.

4. Although Christ speaks of himself here in his *official* character, still there is an index in the passage, directing our minds to a higher contemplation of his nature; for the knowledge of him is placed on a perfect *equality* with the knowledge of the Father, as the germ and principle of eternal life; and the same Apostle elsewhere defines what this higher nature is, where he says of Christ, “This is the true God and eternal life.”

This passage, therefore, only goes *far enough* to prove the *exclusion* from Deity of all false gods, but not far enough to contradict the *inclusion* of the Son in the one Deity of the Bible.

He next quoted MATT. xii. 50, in order to prove the exclusive Deity of the Father exclusively: “For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.”—But, in order to show that there is nothing referred to the Father here, which is peculiar to him to the exclusion of the Son, I refer to JOHN iii. 13, in which Christ asserts that he was “in heaven,” while he was conversing with Nicodemus upon earth; and to JOHN xiv. 15



in which he directs his disciples to do his will, by saying, "Keep *my* commandments."

That our Saviour directed his disciples to pray to the Father, when he prescribed for their use that form which is called the Lord's Prayer, is a fact which I readily concede ; but I maintain, that he did not direct them to pray to the Father *only*. What is the meaning of the word "Father" in this prayer? I consider it to be a designation of the Divine Being, as *our* Father, Creator, and Preserver. But does not Mr Porter pray to the Father, through the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ? Let him look, then, to the Lord's Prayer, and will he find the slightest direction to pray through a mediator? Therefore his argument derived from this prayer, against praying *to* Christ, would equally contradict the doctrine of praying *through* Christ as Mediator, since, as I said, there is no allusion whatever in the Lord's Prayer to a mediator. But it is very easy to show, that every clause in the Lord's Prayer is applicable to Christ. For instance : He is "our Father," in the sense of Creator and Preserver (COL. i. 16, 17) ; he was "in heaven" as to his divine nature, at the time when he prescribed this form (JOHN iii. 13) ; his name is to be "hallowed ;" for "at the name of Jesus every knee should bow" (PHIL. ii. 10). His kingdom is spoken of repeatedly in the New Testament as the object of hope and expectation to his people ; and if we examine the other parts of this prayer, we can easily arrive at the conclusion that every clause of it is as applicable to the Son as to the Father.

Mr Porter quoted MATT. xviii. 19 : "If two of you shall agree on earth touching anything they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven ;" and he challenged me to produce a similar declaration in reference to the Son. I willingly accept the challenge, and refer him to JOHN xiv. 14, in which Christ says, "If ye shall ask anything in my

name, *I will do it.*" And I would here make this general observation, that whatever principle Mr Porter advances, in opposition to the Deity of the Son, *equally militates against the Deity of the Father*; and that I can advance equally decisive proofs for the Deity of the Son as those which he brings forward in support of the Deity of the Father. And I would also remark, that Mr Porter's arguments have been founded upon an assumption that I believe in the existence of *two Gods*; whereas, my second proposition asserts, that Christ "possesses the *same* eternity, knowledge, power, authority, prerogatives, and *Godhead* with the Father, and is *one* with him in all attributes." Let Mr Porter, then, admit the Deity of the Son, or let him deny the Deity of the Father. Upon his principles of reasoning there is no other alternative. He has but this option; let him at once represent the Bible as a system of Atheism, or let him admit the doctrine of the Deity of Christ.

His next quotation was the prayer of our Saviour, recorded in MART. xxvi. 39: "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." But this petition, which Christ offered up in the "*days of his flesh*," affords no objection against his Deity; but is simply a proof of the pure, unspotted, and immaculate holiness of his character. Every person will recoil from sufferings which are the consequence of sin, in proportion to the holiness of character which he possesses. On this principle, when Christ was approaching the hour of his enduring that chastisement which was rendered necessary by the sins of his people, the moral purity of his nature naturally shrunk back from the awful and tremendous infliction. And could we imagine the Father to have been manifest in the flesh in the same sense as the Son was, he would, upon this principle, have shrunk back from the same sufferings, considered as the consequence of sin. Nor has the Son less holiness of nature than

the Father ; for the angels in glory veil their faces in obsequious homage before the throne of the immaculate Jesus, whilst they cry one to another, “ Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts ; the whole earth is full of his glory.”

---

MR PORTER.—Many of the present auditory are too well acquainted with myself and my sentiments, to require that I should vindicate myself from the supposition of knowingly or willingly either doing or saying anything that could by possibility bring the Scriptures of truth into contempt, or diminish their authority as a rule of faith and a guide of conduct. But there are others to whom I may not be so well known, and who may perhaps require, in order to remove misconception from their minds, that I should thus publicly and explicitly declare that, in those opinions which Mr Bagot has pronounced respecting the excellence and value of the sacred Scriptures, I entirely and cordially concur. Neither is this principle peculiar to myself, as a member of the sect or party to which it is my honour and happiness to belong : my fellow Unitarians, without exception, so far as they are known to me, share in the same sentiments. Let me remind such of you as know it, and inform such of you as know it not, that the very words in which Mr Bagot has expressed his admiration of the Scriptures are taken from a Unitarian writer. In the presence of so many illustrious persons, so highly distinguished not only for rank, but for intellectual attainments, it is possible that Mr Bagot may have forgotten the source from which this quotation was drawn : but I will remind him of the person ; a man of some distinction in his day, though, we may well suppose, not of so much consequence that his name should dwell in Mr Bagot’s memory. It was a certain JOHN LOCKE, a Unitarian, who said that the

Bible had "*God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter.*" Those who concur with LOCKE in other points agree with him also in this.

There are some other observations of Mr Bagot's to which I shall allude ; and, first, I shall answer the question which he proposed to me, in asking how I explain that passage which occurs in REV. xix. 12, "*He had a name written that no man knew but himself.*" I reply, that I explain the verse exactly in the same way as King James's translators, who were all orthodox men—strenuous Trinitarians every one—I believe most of them decided Calvinists. How did they understand the passage ? Did they interpret it in Mr Bagot's sense ? No ; for they translated it differently from him, and in a way which every Greek scholar will agree that it readily admits.

Mr Bagot says that he is not one of those that wish to add to the Word of God. I am happy to hear it ; for I think I remember one instance in which he showed a disposition to do so. I allude to his unhappy reference to 1 JOHN v. 7. It is well for Mr Bagot that he was not some unfortunate Unitarian who quoted such a passage as this. Had he belonged to that sect everywhere spoken against, and had he put forward, in that cause, to prove his positions or to support his statements, texts which are *gross*, and *manifest*, and *acknowledged forgeries*—oh, how the tones of astonishment would have thundered from the pulpit and resounded on the platform ; and how the notes of exclamation would have bristled in the printed page ! We should then have heard a great deal about adding to the Word of God ; and we should have been reminded of a passage in that book of REVELATION, of which Mr Bagot is so fond, where it is written, in chap. xxii. 18,—

For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things,

God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book !

I appeal to those who know the state of the controversy, and the manner in which it has hitherto been carried on, if the results I have here stated would not, in the case supposed, have been fully realised.

But Mr Bagot has not only come forward as a theologian—he must try his hand at criticism ; and the first fruits of his efforts are, that the word “ FATHER,” when applied to the supreme being, means *Creator*. The criticism, however, will scarcely answer his purpose, for there is mention in Scripture of the “ *God and FATHER* of our Lord Jesus Christ.” You will remember that he has put it to me to produce Scripture proofs that Christ has a Creator—proofs which I shall furnish in their due time. Meanwhile, it is manifest, on his own showing, that if there is a *God and FATHER* of our Lord Jesus Christ, there must be one who is his Creator. What opinion Mr Bagot has formed of the understanding of his auditory I know not ; but I should think myself guilty of not only treating the Word of God with disrespect, but your intellects with *contempt*, if I came forward to tell you that every word of the Lord’s Prayer applies to the Lord Jesus Christ. This was a prayer which Christ himself taught his disciples ; this was a prayer which he, with his own lips, dictated to his disciples, and addressed expressly to the FATHER ; and yet Mr Bagot says that every word of that prayer applies to himself !

I shall not further follow Mr Bagot into those criticisms to which he had recourse, for indeed it is unnecessary. You have had different specimens of this sort from him, but I mean not further to expose them. If there be a mind so constituted as to imagine that Scripture ought to be explained in this way—a way which would make its declarations mean anything or nothing—that mind is of such a nature that I should address myself to it in vain. With that mind I have no com-

mon principle, and my most strenuous exertions would fail to produce conviction. I hope, however, you do not suppose that I pass over the remarks of Mr Bagot because I cannot answer them. I pass them over for a different reason ; because I am not afraid of their result on any reflecting mind. And now I turn from *criticism*, so called ; now I turn from explanations of the Lord's Prayer, such as you have heard ; and from interpretations which make Christ's words, "*if you ask anything in my name,*" mean "*you shall ask me*"—to the plain teaching of God's word, by which alone this question must be decided. I was quoting some *texts wherein the one God is expressly distinguished from the Lord Jesus Christ in such a manner that the alleged Deity of the latter is entirely excluded*. In addition to the proofs already brought forward, I shall now refer you to—

ROM. xv. 5, 6. Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded one toward another, according to Christ Jesus ; that ye may, with one mind and one mouth, glorify GOD, *EVEN THE FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

I do not care whether you adopt Mr Bagot's criticism, and call it "*God, even the Creator of our Lord Jesus Christ,*" or allow the words to stand as they are ; there is a plain distinction between "*God*" and our Saviour, to the entire exclusion of the latter from deity. Again I shall refer you to—

2 COR. i. 3. Blessed be GOD, *EVEN THE FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ*, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort.

And 2 COR. xi. 31. *THE GOD AND FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ*, who is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.

These sentiments are mine. I bow my knee, with the Apostle, to the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. I own, with the Apostle, that he had a *God and Father*. I believe the express testimony of Scripture on the subject. I receive it in its plain, simple, obvious sense and meaning. I leave it to others who believe

in creeds, to puzzle themselves with essences, subsistences, hypostases, and plurality of persons, distinctions, or somewhats ! My creed requires no such aids. It is that indicated by the Scripture phraseology in—

EPH. i. 3. Blessed be the GOD AND FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly [places] in Christ.

And in EPH. i. 17. [In my prayers] that THE GOD of our Lord Jesus Christ, the FATHER OF GLORY, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him.

Surely no distinction can be more marked in itself, or more consistently preserved, than that which these passages make between our Lord Jesus Christ and that Supreme Being who is called his “GOD,” and his “FATHER.” To the same effect is—

COL. i. 3. We give thanks to God, even THE FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you.

Where it is to be observed that, instead of “*even*,” the received version reads “*and*”—to give a plausible ground for prayer to the Trinity. But this makes perfect nonsense of the passage. I say, this makes nonsense of the passage ; for suppose the term *God* to mean the three persons of the Trinity, the verse will read thus, “*We give thanks to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost—AND TO THE FATHER!*—which would be absurd.

1 PET i. 3. Blessed be THE GOD AND FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

1 THESS. i. 3. Remembering without ceasing your work of faith and labour of love, and patience of hope, in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of GOD, EVEN OUR FATHER.

These last two texts plainly show that the distinction between Christ and God, which it was my object to prove, is carefully preserved by the sacred writers.

1 THESS. i. 9, 10. . . . Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God ; and to wait for his Son from heaven,



whom he raised from the dead, *even Jesus*, who delivered us from the wrath to come.

I shall now turn your attention to—

SOME PASSAGES IN WHICH CHRIST TEACHES THAT GOD THE FATHER IS THE ONLY OBJECT OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

MATT. vi. 16. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and *glorify* YOUR FATHER who is in heaven.

MATT. vi. 8. YOUR FATHER knoweth what things ye have need of *before ye ask him*.

I also refer to that prayer, commonly called the Lord's Prayer (MATT. vi. 9, &c.), which, I do think, is an address to "THE FATHER" exclusively, notwithstanding the authority of Mr Bagot's assertion to the contrary. Again we read in—

MATT. vii. 11. If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall YOUR HEAVENLY FATHER give good things unto them that ask him?

Here it is plainly taken for granted that OUR HEAVENLY FATHER is the person to whom prayer ought to be addressed. I do not agree with Mr Bagot that the word *Father* is equivalent to *Creator*. If indeed that criticism be admitted, it would be destructive to his own theory.

The same principle, that the Father alone is the object of religious worship, is assumed in—

MARK. xi. 25, 26. When ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any; that YOUR FATHER who is in heaven may also forgive you your trespasses.

Our Lord does not say, Forgive your brethren, that "GOD THE FATHER, *God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost*," may forgive you your trespasses; but "THE FATHER"—"*your Father who is in heaven*." The Father, therefore, is the object of worship. To the same conclusion we are led by—

LUKE xi. 1, 2. As he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. And he said unto them, "When ye pray, say, OUR FATHER WHO ART IN HEAVEN!"

This is the same mode of address which occurs in the Lord's Prayer, but taught on another occasion ; for it appears from the circumstances related in the context, that this could not be the form delivered in connection with the Sermon on the Mount. This prayer sanctions the principle which I before laid down, that, according to our Saviour's instruction, prayer is to be addressed specifically to *the Father*. This was the form which our Saviour taught, "OUR FATHER who art in heaven ;" but who, I would ask, taught that form of prayer which is offered up by orthodox congregations, and which forms a part of established Liturgies ; and which is addressed to "God the Son," and "God the Holy Ghost," and to "the glorious Trinity, three persons and one God?" Who taught it I know not ; but I am sure it was never taught by our Lord Jesus Christ.

JOHN xv. 16. I have chosen you, . . . that whatsoever ye shall ask THE FATHER *in my name*, he may give it you.

I presume this passage sufficiently explains the text upon which Mr Bagot laid so much stress, "If ye ask anything in my name, I will give it you." If Scripture be explained by Scripture, and passage by passage, and those places in which ambiguities may be found by those which are direct and plain, all difficulties will vanish. Here THE FATHER is to be asked, because he alone can grant.

I shall even refer to the 26th verse of this chapter, the same which Mr Bagot quoted :—

JOHN xvi. 26. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you. Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full. I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you : for the Father himself loveth you.

I find I made a mistake in the reference, this not being the text to which Mr Bagot adverted ; but it is as express as the other ; it tells against his own cause, and overturns the argument built on those texts which he delivered yesterday with such rapid volubility ; for it shows that *the Father, not Christ*, is the being to whom petitions are to be addressed. Farther—

CHRIST HIMSELF ADDRESSED PRAYER TO THE FATHER, AND  
TO THE FATHER ONLY.

And this, it must be allowed, is a circumstance which bears directly on the question at issue between us. Hitherto I have been strengthening Mr Bagot's first proposition against himself ; but I now proceed to draw the net a little closer around him, by bringing in those proofs which will plainly and directly establish my own second proposition. And I have indeed done so in some degree already, by the distinction which I have shown to exist in the language of Scripture, between God and our Saviour ; but the texts to which I now refer will establish the point even more directly.

JOHN xi. 41, 42. Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, FATHER ! I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always : but because of the people who stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou has sent me.

Can words be more express ? Can these words be reconciled with the opinion which makes Christ himself the hearer of prayer, and the person who is alone able to grant petitions ? If Christ were God, why should he pray at all ? It will be said, as has been said, that Christ had no need of praying for himself, and that he did so only as an example to others ; but that assertion is dishonourable to Christ. It would make his example to be the example of hypocrisy. I do not believe that such a charge lies against our Saviour ; for I am sure that our Lord never prayed but *in spirit and in truth*, and for blessings actually desired. Our Lord declares to his disciples in—

JOHN xiv. 16. *I will pray* THE FATHER, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.

These words represent *the Father* as the being to whom our Lord addressed prayer, and looked for blessings.

JOHN xvii. 1. These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, FATHER! the hour is come: glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee!

JOHN xvii. 5. And now, O FATHER! glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.

JOHN xvii. 11. . . . HOLY FATHER! keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are.

As a sufficient answer to the arguments broached on this subject, arising from the text "I and my Father are one," I read—

JOHN xvii. 21. [I pray] as thou, FATHER! art in me, and I in thee; *that they also may be one in us*: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

This text affords a sufficient answer to the argument brought forward by Mr Bagot, proving the Deity of the Son, by the mutual indwelling which subsists between him and the Father. If that text proves the Deity of the Son, the one now before us equally proves the Deity of all his followers.

JOHN xvii. 24. FATHER! I will that they also whom thou hast given me may be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.

Here not only does our Saviour address prayer *to the Father*, but it is declared that the glory to which Christ attained was a glory *which his Father gave him*; and the ground for the impartation of this gift was the love which the Father bore to the Son. This, however, is perfectly incompatible with the idea of his perfect Deity. How could glory be *given* to that Being who possesses, from eternity, all glory, power and honour?

JOHN xvii. 25. O RIGHTEOUS FATHER! the world hath not known thee; but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me.

I quote these texts from every part of JOHN xvii. to show that the whole of it is a prayer addressed *to the Father*;—a prayer the most solemn and the most impressive ever written. I now turn to—

JOHN xii. 27, 28. Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? FATHER! save me from this hour: but therefore came I unto this hour. FATHER! glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, [saying], I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.

These affecting words were spoken at a time when a cruel fate was about to overtake the Saviour, and his end was drawing near. Observe the person to whom his prayer was addressed, and the total submission of his soul to another's will; and ask yourselves, if this be the language of God Supreme!

MATT. xxvi. 39. And he went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O FATHER! *if it be possible, let this cup pass from me*: nevertheless, not as I will, but as THOU wilt.

This text was formerly quoted by me, and explained by Mr Bagot; but his explanation I leave to make its own impression.

MATT. xxvi. 42. And he went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O MY FATHER! if this cup may not pass away from me except I drink it, *thy will be done*.

The same transactions are recorded in MARK xiv. 35-39; LUKE xxii. 41-45; with the addition, by LUKE, that there appeared to him an angel strengthening him. An angel to strengthen Almighty God!

Again, when his disciples seemed disposed to resist the officers who were sent to apprehend him, he said to one of them—

MATT. xxvi. 53. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to

MY FATHER, and HE will *give me* more than twelve legions of angels?

And when he hung upon the cross, we read—

LUKE xxiii. 34. Then said Jesus, FATHER! forgive them, for they know not what they do.

And we find that in—

MATT. xxvii. 46. About the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, *Eli! Eli! lama sabachthani!* that is to say, My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me!

Still farther, as we find it recorded in—

LUKE xxii. 46. When Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, FATHER! into thy hands I commend my spirit. And having thus said he gave up the ghost.

And now, my friends—fellow Christians—fellow Protestants—you who take the Bible for your guide—you who make the example of Jesus your model—you who take the word of Jesus for your rule!—I ask you what is that worship which is required to be offered up by the disciples of Jesus? Are we to suppose, if there be a proper Deity of the Father—and if there be a proper Deity of the Word—and if there be a proper Deity of the Holy Ghost—are we to suppose that he, who left us an example that we should follow his steps, would so far mislead us by that example as to confine our worship to *one* only; whereas to *three* persons that worship is due? I call on any of you to sit down, and read the record of Christ's life—to find him engaged frequently in prayer to the Father, from the earliest period of his ministry on earth—to see how, in every circumstance of his eventful life, he addresses himself in supplication to the Father who sent him—to find him, when about to work miracles, address the throne of God in prayer—to observe how, when about to part with his disciples, he commends them in solemn petition to his Father—to find him, when his crucifixion was approaching, expressing his humility and resignation to God by prayer to his Father—to find him,

on the cross, commending his murderers to the mercy of their Maker, and his own spirit to the God who gave it ;—yes, follow him in his devotions from the beginning to the close of his career, and then say, if you can—all these facts being taken together—whether this is the conduct of one who was God over all blessed for ever ? This is a point which would well bear to be dilated on ; but I spare you. It is an argument which addresses itself us much to the heart as to the head. I have read to you the words of our blessed Saviour ; and if they do not speak to your feelings, why should I address myself to your understandings ?

As I have now but a short time remaining of my forty minutes, I shall not enter on a new argument. I was about to reply to some observations advanced by Mr Bagot ; but these topics I must reserve for my last speech on this day.

---

MR BAGOT.—Mr Porter has informed you, in his last address, that I have been indebted to a Unitarian writer, Mr LOCKE, for the eulogium which I pronounced upon the Bible this day. This remark affords me an opportunity of observing, that I am at all times ready to extract what is excellent from the writings of any man, even from those of PRIESTLEY, BELSHAM, or DRUMMOND, or any other Unitarian. But as to whether Mr LOCKE was a Unitarian or not I do not know, nor, as far as my argument is concerned, do I care ; for though he was a philosopher of the first class, invested with great powers of intellect, which qualified him to be a guide and conductor through the intricate mazes of scientific research, yet Mr LOCKE, as well as every other man who wishes to know the way of salvation, and how, as a sinner, he can be reconciled with God, must approach the Gospel as a little child, and learn at the feet of Jesus ; for “Where is the wise ? where is



the scribe ? where is the disputer of this world ? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world ?”

I shall now examine the principle by which Mr Porter has reconciled the passage in REV. xix. 12, with the omniscience of the Father. The passage in REV. xix. 12, is as follows : “He had a name written which no one (*οὐδείς*) knew but he himself ;” and the question which I proposed to Mr Porter was this, How could he reconcile this declaration, that no one but Christ knew the name which he bore but he himself, with the omniscience of the Father ? and what solution of this difficulty would he propose ? He has now informed us, that he adopts the same view of the passage which King James’s translators have chosen, and that he understands the Greek word *οὐδείς* in a restricted sense, as denoting “no man ;” so that, instead of translating the word *οὐδείς* in its plain and obvious sense, as denoting “no one,” whether created or uncreated, he understands it in a more limited sense, as it occurs in the English version of the passage. Now, I shall apply the very same principle of restriction to the interpretation of MARK xiii. 32 : “But of that day and that hour knoweth no man ; no, not the angels which are in heaven ; neither the Son, but the Father :” and I reconcile this declaration with the omniscience of Christ in the very same manner, by understanding it as referring only to the *human* knowledge of the Saviour. I assume it as a Scripture truth, that Christ was omniscient as to his higher nature. This is evident from comparing JER. xvii. 9, 10, with REV. ii. 23 ; and from many other passages. I argue, therefore, that I must interpret MARK xiii. 32, upon a principle which will not contradict this doctrine. I, therefore, explain this text as referring to the knowledge which Christ possessed in his *human nature*. I proved to you, on yesterday, that when Christ assumed our nature, he became “in *all* things like unto his brethren ;” but this would not have been true if he had not assumed *our ignorance*.

This passage, therefore, affords no objection against the Deity of Christ. What right, however, had Mr Porter to quote this passage as affording an argument *against* my system? It is an *affirmative proof of that part of my second proposition, which asserts that the Lord Jesus Christ is perfect man*. It is an essential attribute of a "perfect man" to possess a faculty of *progressively* acquiring knowledge, and, after all his acquirements, to be capable of only a *limited* amount of knowledge; and, in reference to Christ, I prove the former by LUKE ii. 52, which asserts that "Jesus increased in wisdom;" and I prove the latter by reference to the passage under consideration, which asserts that there was something which he was ignorant of. As to his divine nature, I again remark, that there is a copiousness of proof to demonstrate that his knowledge is one with the Father's; as, for instance, in his own declarations: "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father;" "No one knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any one the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him:" and, from the language of Peter, "Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee," which is equivalent to a regular syllogistic inference, that because Christ knew all things, he therefore knew that Peter loved him; but it is evident that Peter would have been a bad logician, if he had used the word "all" in this passage in a restricted sense, as he could not have inferred from Christ's knowing *some* things, that he knew that Peter loved him, inasmuch as this fact might have been among the *some* things which, on this supposition, Christ did not know. The "all things," therefore, in the language of Peter, must mean "all things" in an *absolute* and unrestricted sense; otherwise his argument would be bad logic. To reconcile these declarations, therefore, of the omniscience of Christ with MARK xiii. 32, I am obliged to consider the latter passage as a *positive* and *affirmative* proof

that Christ possessed a true human mind ; and I will not submit to be placed on the defensive in reference to this text, as I regard it as a *necessary affirmative proof of part of my second proposition.*

As to the passage thrown up against me in 1 JOHN v. 7, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one," I beg to ask, What right had Mr Porter to bring it forward ? Did I quote this text as an argument amongst the passages to which I yesterday referred ? Certainly not ; and surely Mr Porter had no right to criticise any passage as an argument on my side, unless what I have actually advanced. But as he has asserted that this text is an interpolation, I call upon him to bring forward, in detail, the proofs, by which he supports this assertion.

Mr Porter has rested some of his arguments upon an assumption that I hold it as a principle, that the word Father, in Scripture, is *always* used in the sense of Creator. I beg to say, that I have made no such assertion. What I believe, in reference to this subject, is, that in *several* passages the term "Father" is unquestionably used in the sense of "Creator ;" as, for instance, in MAL. ii. 10, "Have we not all one Father ? hath not one God created us ?" I also believe that the term Father is used to designate what we term the First Person of the Trinity, as the Father of Christ, which he is in a vastly different sense from that in which he is the Father of Christians. There is a remarkable combination of these two senses of the term Father in JOHN xx. 17, in which Christ says, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and unto my God and your God." He does not say, "I ascend unto our Father and our God ; but he uses language which clearly marks the distinction which there is in the import of the terms which he employs when applied to himself and to his people. I, therefore, infer that the term "Father" is used in Scripture in two senses : it

is applied to the Father of Christians and to the Father of Christ.

As to the wise declaration which Mr Porter made in his last speech, that "he would not answer Mr Bagot's criticisms, because his most strenuous exertions would fail to produce conviction;" this was a very good reason, indeed; and I beg to express my obligations to him for it, and to assure him that I perfectly concur with him in recognising the validity of the reason which it assigns.

I stated yesterday that the Scriptures speak of Christ in three points of view; as Mediator, as perfect man, and as perfect God. As Mediator, I believe that he is subordinate to the Father, who sustains the higher office; and I now wish to advance a few additional proofs of his mediatorial subordination. These you will find in ROM. xv. 5, 6; 2 COR. i. 3; xi. 31; EPH. i. 3; COL. i. 3; 1 THESS. i. 3-9; 1 PET. i. 3. On examining these passages at your leisure, you will find that they all prove satisfactorily the mediatorial subordination of Christ to the Father. I wish, however, to make a remark upon one or two of them.

In 1 THESS. i. 9, we read of Christians "turning to God from idols to serve the living and true God." Now it is easy to show, from a comparison of this text with other parts of Scripture, that Christ is "the living and true God;" for the eternal employment of the glorified saints is represented in REV. xxii. 3, as "serving God and the Lamb;" and the Father has given this command, in reference to Christ, which is recorded in HEB. i. 6, "Let all the angels of God worship him." Now, unless Mr Porter allow that Christianity has done nothing more than turn men from one system of idolatry to another, *it must follow, from these texts, that Christ is the living and true God.*

Again, I would remark, in reference to 2 COR. i. 3, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," that it proves the Deity of the Holy Ghost;

for we read, in LUKE i. 35, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee ; *therefore* also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Hence it is evident that the Holy Ghost is the Father of the Son of God, and consequently is God.

Mr Porter has again referred to the Lord's Prayer, upon which I have already commented, and must now revert to it, in order to correct a misapprehension into which he has fallen. He seemed to think that I spoke of that prayer as if it was to be exclusively offered up to Christ. I certainly hold no such opinion. I believe that the words "Our Father" are a general designation of the Divine Being—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And I beg leave, again, to say, that I do not consider it necessary to deny the true Deity of the Father, as a preliminary to proving the true Deity of Christ.

In reference to MATT. vi. 14, "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you," which Mr Porter quoted, in order to prove the Deity of the Father, I beg to remark, that it establishes a principle by which the Deity of the Son necessarily follows, as the Son also exercises the same divine prerogative of forgiving sins, as is asserted in COL. iii. 13, "Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any ; even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye."

I must now refer to the mode by which Mr Porter endeavoured to obviate the argument for the Deity of Christ, which I derived from JOHN xiv. 14, "If ye shall ask anything in my name, *I will do it.*" He produced the declaration of Christ, in JOHN xvi. 23, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, *he will give it you ;*" and he told us, with the most perfect composure, that the latter passage explains the former, so as to bring it into consistency with his views ! I should be anxious to know on what *principle* the latter text explains the former ? Does Mr Porter apply

to the interpretation of Scripture some principle of criticism similar to that by which positive and negative quantities in algebraic computations destroy and neutralise each other? Does he place the sign of *plus* before one passage, and of *minus* before another; and then, by an algebraic calculation, neutralise the one by the other? For my part, I believe the two declarations contained in these two portions of the word of God. I believe that the Father will give what the Christian prays for in the name of Christ; and I also believe that Christ will give what the Christian prays for: for I believe that "what things soever the Father doeth, the same doeth the Son likewise," JOHN v. 19. And I would not wish to apply the principle which Mr Porter has adopted, of neutralising Scripture by a rule similar to that by which positive and negative quantities in algebra destroy each other.

Mr Porter has laid great stress upon the fact that Christ prayed to the Father only, whilst he was upon earth. I answer, Is there not a sufficiency of Scripture evidence to demonstrate the duty of praying to Christ? did not Stephen pray to him in his dying hour? did not the Apostle Paul pray to him thrice, to be delivered from the thorn in the flesh? and were not Christians designated as those who called upon the name of Christ? Does Mr Porter require of me to produce evidence of Christ's praying to himself? Surely this is manifestly one of those duties, in support of which he could not leave his own example. In many points, the example of Christ, considered as a model for our moral imitation, was defective; he did not leave the example of being a good husband or a good father; and, from the nature of the thing, he could not leave us an example of praying to himself: it were absurd to expect it. We must obviously look to the conduct of the apostles and disciples, as recorded in the rest of Scripture, for practical evidence in support of this duty.

The next passage which Mr Porter quoted was JOHN xi. 41, "Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." But this, however, is *not a prayer* for ability to perform the miracle of raising Lazarus ; and the words which follow in the 42d verse explain the object of the Saviour in this address: "And I knew that thou hearest me always ; but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." Mr Porter has asked the following question, upon which he seemed to lay considerable stress: "If Christ be God, why should he have prayed at all?" I answer this question by simply proposing another, "If Christ was man, why should he have lived without prayer?"

He next referred to JOHN xv. 26, in which Christ says to his disciples, "I will pray the Father, and he will send you another Comforter." But this passage only supplies me with part of the argument by which I prove that the Father and the Son are one, in the act of sending the Spirit to the church: the remainder of the argument, which attributes the exercise of the same prerogative to Christ, occurs in JOHN xv. 26, "When the Comforter is come, *whom I will send* unto you from the Father."

I shall now direct your attention to the prayer of our Saviour, which is recorded in the 17th chapter of JOHN, which Mr Porter evidently regards as supplying him with irrefragable arguments against the doctrine of the deity of Christ. This prayer, however, was presented to the Father in the "days of his flesh," and is easily accounted for by the *official* station which the Redeemer occupied as the great High Priest of his people's profession. It was customary for the high priest, immediately before the great day of atonement, to offer up a solemn prayer to God—first, for himself ; secondly, for the sons of Aaron, who were joined with him in the priesthood ; and thirdly, for the entire congregation of the people. If you examine this prayer of Christ's, you



will find an exact correspondence with this arrangement. From verse 1 to 5, he prays for himself; from verse 6 to 19, he prays for the apostles, who were, in a subordinate sense, united with him in the great office of preaching the gospel; and from verse 20 to the end he prays for his whole church: and the time when he offered up this prayer was immediately before that solemn hour in which he offered himself without spot to God, and it was uttered by him in his *official* character as our great High Priest.

I shall now refer to some parts of this prayer, in order to show that the language it contains is totally inconsistent with the condition of a creature. In the first verse he prays in these remarkable words: "Father, glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee." Now, imagine a creature presenting such a prayer as this—asking his Creator to glorify him, *in order that he might glorify his Creator!* Imagine, for instance, Gabriel himself, who stands upon a lofty elevation within the sunshine of the eternal throne, adopting such language in prayer to that Being who imparts to him all that seraphic intelligence which gives emphasis and vigour to the anthem in which he celebrates the matchless glory of his Creator! Nor is the language which occurs in the fifth verse more consistent with the character and condition of a creature: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." In this passage Christ takes a *retrospective* view of the glory which he had with the Father before the creation of the world, in terms which prove that his glory *was precisely the same as the glory of the Father*; and he takes a *prospective* view of the glory which he should resume when the period of his official subordination had expired. Now, I ask, does this verse contain the language of a creature? Could a creature pray to his Creator to glorify him in this way? Alas, alas! Surely, if we calculate the distance which exists between the

lowest and the highest created being, that distance is but a speck when contrasted with the unmeasured interval which there is between the highest created being and the Lord of hosts !—and surely an humbler style of address would suit the dependence and inferiority of any created intelligence, no matter how exalted !

I now direct your attention to the 10th verse: “And all mine are thine, and thine are mine.” Mark the emphasis of this declaration : all that belongs to the Father belongs also to the Son ; and all which belongs to the Son belongs also to the Father. Now, again, imagine a created being adopting such an assertion as this in prayer to Jehovah, “All mine are thine, and thine are mine”—an assertion which implies that there is a reciprocity of interest, and a mutual possession of property, between the Father and the Son ; and this necessarily results from the fact that the Father and the Son are one God, in consequence of which there is this mutual proprietorship between them. And here I lay down this general position, that although the New Testament contains abundant proofs of the official subordination of Christ to the Father, yet these proofs are intermixed with statements which lead us up to a recognition of his Deity, like so many bright and lucid spots emanating from the eclipsed splendour of his Divinity, and bursting through the opposing vail of that humanity in which he tabernacled amongst men. This chapter contains several of these lucid points, which serve as indices to conduct us to a contemplation of a higher glory than the Saviour manifested here below. Look, for further example, to the 24th verse, in which he does not say, “Father, I pray,” or “Father, I entreat ;” but he says, in language which simply contains a declaration of his *purpose* and *intention*, “Father, I WILL that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am ; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me.” Surely such a style of address as this would be blasphemy and presumption

of the blackest dye, in the mouth of a merely *created* being, and such as would excite the astonishment of even Satan himself! And how could Christ have adopted this language if he did not possess an authority and a power which was one with the Father's, and independent of all superior control? This allusion of Mr Porter's to the 17th of JOHN was most unfortunate for his cause. I admit that Christ did pray, and I admit that this proves his inferiority, *so far as his humanity is concerned*; yet even in this prayer there are several intimations interspersed, which, as I have already shown, lead us up to a contemplation of a higher glory.

But, in connection with this chapter which I have been considering, Mr Porter has asked, Why did Christ pray to the Father to give him glory, since, if he was God, he could not acquire more glory than he already possessed? I ask, in reply, What does the Psalmist mean when he says, in PSALM xix., "The heavens declare the glory of God"? I ask, If the Father is God, possessing an immense and immeasurable expanse of glory—a glory commensurate with infinity and everlasting as eternity, how could creation add to the glory of the supreme and everlasting God? And yet creation does give glory to God. The glory, therefore, for which the Saviour prayed was this—that the glory of being the Saviour and Redeemer might be superadded to his previous glory of being the Creator and Preserver of men; so that now all glory, moral and natural, might be concentrated into one great mass, so as to form an amplitude of splendour, which would command the homage of the intelligent creation of God!

Mr Porter next referred to JOHN xii. 27: "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour; but for this cause came I unto this hour." I see no difficulty whatever in this text, when I recollect what ISAIAH said, that Christ should make

his soul an offering for sin ; for when we speak of the atonement of the Saviour, we should not restrict our views to the offering of his *body* upon Calvary, but should take into account the agonies of his *soul*, which he endured in the garden of Gethsemane. But does it militate against his Deity to say that his soul was troubled ? Do we not read in Scripture, that God is *grieved* and *angry* with the wicked every day ? and is it not as difficult to reconcile these statements with the Deity of the Father, as to reconcile the passage under consideration with the Deity of the Son ? But if Christ be the highest superangelic being, I ask, How could his soul be troubled ? And whatever answer Mr Porter will give to this will supply me with a solution of whatever difficulty he thinks is connected with the Deity of Christ by this text.

Mr Porter referred to the fact of an angel's having strengthened Christ in the garden. I reply, that if he argues that this circumstance proves him to be inferior to the Father, it also proves him to be inferior to the angel who strengthened him ; for how could a superangelic being be strengthened by a being inferior to himself ?

Mr Porter informed us yesterday, that he did not believe in the *mere* humanity of Christ ; and he also argued against the Deity of Christ, on the ground that MATTHEW, who was associated with him during his public ministry, never once mentioned his Deity. I beg to remark, in reply to this, that MATTHEW never once asserted, or gave the slightest intimation of Christ's having been a superangelic being ; so that, if MATTHEW's asserting one thing or the other be of consequence to the argument, we must admit that he taught the lowest Humanitarianism ; for even after the most remarkable of all the miracles which Christ performed, the exclamation of the disciples was, "What *manner of man* is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him ?" And, in short, if we admit that any of the Evangelists

are silent in reference to the Deity of Christ, and deduce an argument from their silence, it must be in favour of that doctrine which teaches that Christ was a mere man.

Mr Porter has adduced the prayers which Christ offered up to his Father on the cross, as evidences of the Deity of the Father exclusively. These prayers are recorded in LUKE xxiii. 34: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;" and in verse 46, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." But I beg to refer him to two similar prayers, offered up by Stephen to the Saviour himself; in ACTS vii. 59, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit;" and verse 60, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." And I argue that Christ must have possessed the same ability to forgive sins, and to receive the soul of Stephen, as he himself attributed to the Father. We should consider also that Stephen *was full of the Holy Ghost*, when he ascribed to Christ the very same prerogatives, offered up the very same prayers, in the very same language, as Christ ascribed and addressed to his Father on the cross. Let Mr Porter now take his choice, whether to believe that Stephen or Christ was the idolater on these occasions.

Mr Porter has presented before our view a beautiful description of the Saviour's conduct whilst on earth, and has asked whether it was such as the eternal and blessed God would adopt? To this question I reply, that the line of conduct which the Saviour pursued, the phraseology which he employed, and the manner in which he appeared before the view of men, were such as a man should adopt, and as a human creature would naturally assume. I believe that, when God was manifest in the flesh, and assumed the body of a man, he naturally acted so far according to the faculties of a man. It is wretched to be obliged to advert to such arguments as these, which prove nothing, unless that they give me an opportunity to illustrate my positive

and affirmative sentiments in reference to the humanity and mediatorial character of Christ.

Mr Porter has asserted in argument, that Christ taught his disciples to *confine* their worship to the Father. This I deny, because he taught no such thing. He taught them to pray to the Father, but he did not teach them to direct their worship to the Father *only*. If worship should be confined to the Father, to the exclusion of the Son, Stephen must have died in an act of idolatry; the angels in heaven are guilty of the same sin; and also the apostle Paul, for he prayed not only once but three times to Christ; and if he had not been well persuaded of his Divinity, surely, when he had received no answer to the first or second petition, he would not have prayed a second or a third time, but would have had recourse to a higher power. But Paul prayed to Christ three times, and at length *received* this gracious reply, "My grace is sufficient for thee, my strength is perfected in weakness." From all this I infer that Christ did not direct his disciples to pray to the Father *only*. But it is not my object to prove that Christians should not worship or pray to the Father; my doctrine is, "that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father." In heaven, as we are told in Rev. v. 12 to 14, the saints and angels worship the Saviour. And I would say to Mr Porter, in conclusion, if you do not acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ *now*, as the object of worship and adoration, and if you do not make him the object of your prayers *now*, you will be constrained to acknowledge the glory and Deity of his person in the world of spirits hereafter. And, oh! what an intense gratification would it be to my mind, were I permitted to look forward with prophetic eye, to that great and joyful day, when Christ shall have lifted up his elect to blessedness and immortality, and to contemplate myself as standing side by side with Mr Porter, joining with him in hallowed and grateful

competition, in singing the anthem of the redeemed :  
“Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and our Father, to him be glory and dominion, for ever and ever. Amen !”

---

MR PORTER.—Before I commence my concluding observations, I wish to put to Mr Bagot a question, which I have a right to ask according to the rules, and to which I expect to receive an answer. In the course of my addresses this day and yesterday I repeatedly characterised 1 JOHN v. 7—the text concerning “*the three heavenly witnesses*,” as they are designated—as an *interpolation*, a *forgery*, and an *imposture*. Mr Bagot has called on me to give in detail my proofs for that assertion. I now ask him, DOES HE DENY IT ?

MR BAGOT.—I am not bound to answer that, because I did not quote that text on my side of the question in this discussion. If I quoted that text in my classification of proofs, I would then consider myself bound to answer the question. But, as Mr Porter has brought that text before the meeting, declaring it to be an interpolation, I have a right still to challenge him to the production of the proofs in detail, by which he justifies his opinion of the text in question.

MR PORTER. — Mr Bagot having answered my question with his usual explicitness, I shall merely say, that I brought that text forward so pointedly, because this discussion arose out of a challenge given by Mr Bagot to all Unitarians, to answer his (in his opinion) unanswerable pamphlet. This challenge I took up, or rather, for reasons already assigned, I declined to take up in his way, performing a different mode. It was out of that “Abstract” that the present discussion originated. In this “Abstract,” which I hold in my hand, I find a reference to 1 JOHN v. 7, in the very first paragraph of the first page, and in the



first line which contains scriptural quotations. After this plain statement, which it is impossible to deny—for the correspondence is in print before the public—I leave it for you to decide whether I asked an improper or irrelevant question.

Mr Bagot, in his last speech, has had recourse to his usual mode of interpreting Scripture. He tells you that, in the Lord's Prayer, the word *our Father* means the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; respecting which, I shall only say, if such were the meaning that our Lord intended to convey, it would have been well had Mr Bagot been present to assist him in mending his phraseology.

Mr Bagot, in the course of some strong observations concerning that text, "*Father! I will that they may be with me,*" has introduced the name of Satan in connection with that of Christ in a way which I shall not characterise, as I shall certainly not imitate. It must be obvious to any person who reads that prayer, even with common attention, that the phrase "*I will*" means, in this passage, the same as *I wish, desire, or pray*; and from the connection in which the words occur they can have no other meaning. I turn, however, from such particular instances to make some general remarks on Mr Bagot's mode of conducting his argument.

I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but a dissenting minister, the son of a dissenting minister; yet having been, at one time of my life, addicted to the study of theology, I have made myself, in some degree, acquainted with the general outline of the reasonings that are put forward in defence of their respective doctrines by the leading sects of the Christian world, and therefore I was able to foresee with tolerable distinctness, and to foretell with some degree of accuracy, the line of argument which my reverend opponent would, of necessity, feel himself obliged to adopt. I was able to tell you beforehand, that the

scriptural passages to which he would refer you for proof of the *Proper Deity of the Word* would not be plain, downright assertions of the fact, or declarations of two natures, existing in one person, and thus composing, or compounding, or in some way making up, what he has elsewhere most unscripturally denominated *the complex person of the Mediator*. I knew well enough such declarations were not to be had, and therefore I knew that Mr Bagot would be obliged to hunt out his doctrine by innuendoes and inferences, and bits, and scraps, and far-fetched allusions, and unnatural juxtapositions. And I now repeat, what I yesterday argued in form, that these deductions, or inductions, or conclusions, are insufficient proofs of a doctrine, which, *if true*, would have been revealed, and, *if revealed*, would not have been left to be sought after and hunted out in the manner described. If true, it would have been *plainly* stated in Scripture, and especially by the writers of the New Testament; for, that they who knew our Lord, and loved him while he was on earth, should have observed a mysterious silence respecting his supposed Deity, is to me inconceivable and incredible.

The manner in which Mr Bagot repeated, or rather *parroted*, the texts which he quoted in his speech of yesterday (with a rapidity and volubility which, as they are not his usual style of delivery, struck me as being neither particularly fair towards his opponent, nor respectful to his auditory, nor reverent to the very serious and important subject before him), as it renders it difficult for me to follow him through the whole detail of his arguments, so it happily renders the task less necessary. It is not likely that statements repeated, or rather *parroted*, so fast, that the mind could scarcely follow them, even when strained to the utmost intensity of exertion; it is not likely that they can have tended much to strengthen conviction in those who were before convinced, or to produce it in

quarters where doubt or hesitation prevailed. Such a mode of getting through the discussion may, indeed, enable him to parade a formidable array of texts before the eye in the printed report, but it is utterly useless as a means of producing any impression upon the persons who have come hither in the hope of hearing a serious question seriously debated, in a calm and *rational* manner. I venture to affirm that, for all the purposes of discussion and debate, he might as well have given the greater part of the texts adduced in the last hour of his harangue in the original Hebrew or Greek. Such an artifice, I must beg leave to tell him, is unworthy of him. He ought to be above it.

Some of his statements, however, were of such a nature that they demand a short notice in reply.

Mr Bagot laid it down as a principle, that a mediator between two parties who are at variance must of necessity be inferior to one of them. Hence, in his whole mediatorial undertaking, he admits that Christ the Son was inferior to the Father. But this inferiority, he maintains, was only *official*; that is, while he acted in this capacity as subordinate to the Father, he was at the same time on an exact equality with him in natural and inherent dignity. Now, I stop not to inquire where he has learned this distinction between *natural* and *official* dignity. I wish to turn your attention to an inference which Mr Bagot deduced from this fanciful distinction. He told us that, as the New Testament contained the history of our Lord's mediatorial undertaking, it was natural that it should abound with declarations of his inferiority to the Father. Now, to my mind, the inference would be precisely the reverse. In writing the history of any illustrious personage, who for a time travelled *incognito*, and in that state was exposed to various accidents, injuries, and insults, which would never otherwise have befallen him—and especially if any doubt had been entertained whether he were really the important personage whom

some alleged that he was—the historian, as a matter of course, would be led, at every turn of his narrative, to make strong and pointed allusions to the dignity of his hero, and to excite our admiration of the patience with which the sovereign endured the ill-treatment that was heaped upon him by his subjects, who were unacquainted with him in his assumed disguise. For proof of this, I could refer you to every narrative of a similar adventure;—from the *Il Bondocani* of the Arabian Tales, to the travels of CHARLES I. and BUCKINGHAM to the Court of Madrid. Now, my friends, as the argument of Mr Bagot assumes that these allusions to the inherent dignity of Jesus do not abound in the New Testament, while assertions and affirmations of his absolute inferiority do abound, I say, *that simple fact* proves that our Lord's followers knew nothing of him in that higher natural character which Mr Bagot claims for him. I thank him, therefore, for the admission that such is the state of the evidence to be gathered from the Evangelists; and I make him a present of the argument which he has built upon it.

But, after all, where has Mr Bagot learned this assumed distinction between the mediatorial and the personal character of our Lord? Where is it written in the New Testament that Christ, as God, is equal to the Father; as Man, he is inferior to the Father; as God and Man united in his mediatorial character, he is officially subordinate, but personally equal to him? Nowhere is it thus written. It is an idea which never entered into the minds of the writers of the Sacred Volume, and of which they have not given the slightest hint. It is an idea full of absurdity and self-contradiction; for how could the unchangeable Being, who presides over the world, divest himself of his inherent glory, and become for a time inferior to another person, to whom, it is supposed, he was in all respects equal and identical? This would be to suppose a being to preside over the universe whose nature is mutable,

and in whom, by consequence, his creatures could repose no confidence.

It would be an idle task to attempt to pursue Mr Bagot through that mazy labyrinth in which he entangled himself, his subject, and his auditors. I feel perfectly assured that, so far as the mere effect of his spoken address is concerned, it would be a waste of time and breath to answer arguments *seriatim* which could not be individually effective, because they could not be individually understood. I shall, therefore, classify them into groups, and deal with them collectively.

In the front were paraded some passages, in which, as Mr Bagot asserted, the names and titles of the Supreme Being are ascribed to Christ.

The first argument was drawn from the term IMMANUEL, found in ISA. vii. 14, and applied to our Saviour in MATT. i. 23. To understand the perfect emptiness of this argument, it is only necessary to read the passage in ISAIAH with its context ; which I shall do from the version of Bishop LOWTH, as being much more accurate than that contained in King James's translation.

#### CHAP. VII.

1. In the days of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, Retsin, king of Syria, and Pekah, the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, came up against Jerusalem to besiege it, but they could not overcome it. And when it was told to the house of David that Syria was supported by Ephraim, the heart of the king and the heart of his people was moved, as the trees of the forest are moved before the
2. wind. And JEHOVAH said to Isaiah, Go out now to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shearjashub thy son, at the end of the aqueduct of the upper pool, at the causeway of the Fuller's
3. field. And thou shalt say unto him,

Take heed, and be still : fear not, neither let thy heart  
be faint,  
Because of the two tails of these smoking firebrands ;  
For the fierce wrath of Retsin, and of the son of Remaliah ;

5. Because Syria hath devised evil against thee,  
Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah, saying,
6. "Let us go up against Judah, and harass it;  
And let us rend off a part of it for ourselves;  
And let us set a king to reign in the midst of it,  
Even the son of Tabeal!"
7. Thus saith the Lord JEHOVAH.  
It shall not stand, neither shall it be.
8. Though the head of Syria be Damascus,  
And the head of Damascus Retsin,  
Yet within threescore and five years  
Ephraim shall be broken, that he be no more a people
9. Though the head of Ephraim be Samaria,  
And the head of Samaria Remaliah's son,  
If ye believe not in me, ye shall not be established.
10. And JEHOVAH spake yet again to Ahaz, saying,
11. Ask thee a sign from JEHOVAH thy God;  
Go deep to the grave! or high to the heaven above!
12. And Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt Jehovah. And he said,
13. Hear ye now, O house of David:  
Is it a small thing for you to weary men,  
That ye should weary my God also?
14. Therefore JEHOVAH himself shall give you a sign:  
Behold, the virgin conceiveth, and beareth a son,  
And she shall call his name Immanuel.
15. Butter and honey shall he eat,  
When he shall know to refuse what is evil, and choose  
what is good:
16. For before this child shall know  
To refuse the evil, and to choose the good,  
The land shall become desolate  
By whose two kings thou art distressed.

Now, my friends, is it not manifest that the birth of IMMANUEL was to be a sign to Ahaz of returning prosperity, which was to occur, and did occur, *in his own day*? It was for this reason that the child thus promised, and given as a token of divine protection, was named IMMANUEL ("*God with us*"), because his birth was an earnest and pledge that Jehovah was with his people. But the name no more implies the Deity of the promised infant, than Mr Bagot's name of *Daniel*

proves him to be "GOD MY JUDGE," which is its literal English ; or than mine of *John* proves me to be "THE MERCIFUL JEHOVAH !" It is manifest from the passages themselves that the name is applied to our Lord by the evangelist in the same sense in which it was previously given to the child IMMANUEL who was born in the reign of Ahaz, because our Saviour's birth also was a pledge and sign of the favour of God to his people.

It is unnecessary for me to enter into any detailed examination of ISA. ix. 6, because Mr Bagot himself admitted—what his partisans are generally very reluctant to allow—that this passage is connected in the narrative with that in the 7th chapter, and applies to the same person. Now, as the former indubitably refers, in the book of ISALAH, to the child whose birth was a sign to Ahaz, and took place in his reign ; it follows that the latter—viz., ISA. ix. 6—does not apply to our Saviour. In perfect accordance with this statement, it will be found that this passage is never quoted as a prophecy, nor even in any way applied to our Lord in the New Testament. It would be easy to show that titles and *names* (for the verse of ISA. ix. 6 is nothing but a *name*), just as lofty as any which here occur, are bestowed in the Old Testament on various personages of distinction. But this is rendered unnecessary by Mr Bagot's admission, that the two passages in ISA. vii. 14, and ISA. ix. 6, refer to the same individual.

Another passage on which Mr Bagot laid much stress, on this as on former occasions, is JOHN i. 1. "*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made.*" My Rev. opponent acts wisely in putting this passage prominently forward in defence of his proposition ; for this passage, and its continuation in the 14th verse, afford the only instances in which the term



“*Word*,” which he imagines to be the proper name of the divine nature of Christ, is supposed to be applied to our Lord at all. For you may observe—if you could attend to the voluble muster-roll of texts that were yesterday poured forth like a torrent into our ears—in not one of them, save these now before us, did the phrase occur, on which Mr Bagot lays so much stress. Strange that the only correct phraseology for describing the most important and fundamental doctrine of the Bible, should be found but in one solitary context from GENESIS to REVELATION ! Strange that the Sacred writers knew so little about the language which they ought to employ for expressing their own doctrines, or rather the heaven-taught doctrines which they were commissioned to record ! Pity that some champion of modern orthodoxy had not been at their elbow as they wrote, to correct the inaccuracies of their style, and to instruct them in the phraseology which it was proper to employ !

On this passage of Scripture, however, now before us, it is worthy of remark, that several learned men have been of opinion, that by the “*Word*” we are not here to understand the *person* of Christ, but the *wisdom* of God which dwelt in him.

But, leaving this observation out of view altogether, and allowing the common translation to stand unaltered, the phrase, “*The Word was God*,” no more proves his Supreme Deity than the language, “*This is my body, this is my blood*,” proves the doctrine of Transubstantiation : and as all Protestants think themselves justified in explaining the latter phrase to mean, “*This represents my body and my blood*,” because the sense of the passage and the nature of things require it ; so are we bound to explain the last clause of this 1st verse of John in a similar sense, if we would avoid fastening on them a contradiction and an absurdity. Let it be observed, that although the same word, *God*, occurs twice in this verse, the phrase is not the same in the origi-

nal. In the first instance, the noun has the emphatic article which limits its signification, so that *it can denote no other* than the Supreme Being. In the latter instance it stands alone, and, of course, *may be construed in a wider sense*—in a sense similar to that in which it is so often applied to Judges, Prophets, and Magistrates :—as in EXOD. vii. 1, where it is given to Moses ; in EXOD. xxi. 6, where, in the original, it is given to the ordinary civil Judges ; in 1 SAM. ii. 25, “ *If one man sin against another, the Judge (Heb. the God) shall judge him ;*” 1 SAM. xxviii. 13, “ *I saw gods (literally, a god) coming up out of the earth.*” It is freely allowed that in all these instances the context and circumstances of the case sufficiently show that the Supreme Deity is not meant : and the same, I do contend, is the case in the verse before us ; for when it is affirmed in the clause preceding, that *the Word was with the true God*—and the same declaration is repeated in the clause which follows—how can we, without violating the first principles of criticism, for one moment imagine that the Word is the same God *with* whom he is ?—the more especially when the suppression of the article in the second clause manifestly marks the transition from the particular to the more general signification of the term *God* ! And this conclusion is rendered still more imperative when we read, in the 3d verse, that the creation effected by Christ (whether moral or material, is nothing to the purpose) was effected by him as an instrument in the hands of the Most High ; for here, as elsewhere, and in all the passages where creation is ascribed to Christ, it is said to have been effected *by* him, *i.e. through* or *by means of* him ; such being the proper meaning of the phrase *διὰ* with a genitive, not *ἐν*.

I know it will be said, as it has been said, in opposition to this view of JOHN i. 1, that it is incorrect to argue for any distinction between the meaning of the word *God* in the two clauses, founded on the absence

of the article in the second instance ; since in the latter clause the term occurs *in the predicate of a proposition*, of which the subject *has* the article ; and therefore, as we are told, according to the Greek idiom, does not admit of its insertion. To show, however, that the Greek language *does admit* of the construction in question, I adduce the following passage from the writings of EUSEBIUS, a Greek himself, who spoke the Greek language vernacularly, and wrote for those who spoke it—who was a man of high rank in the court and confidence of the Emperor Constantine, and was also Bishop of Nicomedia ; one of the prelates who sat at the Council of Nice, and one of the most learned of all the ancient Fathers. This eminent individual says, upon the passage now before us : “The Evangelist clearly indicates the nature of the *Word* by subjoining *καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος* [and the Word was *a* god], although he might have said, *καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος* [and the Word was *the* God], with the addition of the article [before *Θεός*, in the Greek], if he had thought that the Father and the Son are one and the same, and that the Son is God over all.”

Such is the opinion of the learned EUSEBIUS. Let those who think Bishop MIDDLETON a better Greek scholar adhere to his authority !

Another text on which Mr Bagot seemed to lay considerable stress, is JER. xxiii. 5, 6, where he says our Lord is called, “*Jehovah our righteousness* ;” and this being a divine title, our Saviour must be God. Grant the inference ; and turn to JER. xxxiii. 16, where we read : “*In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely ; and this is the name wherewith she shall be called JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.*” Here, then, if there be any soundness in Mr Bagot’s logic in the former case, the city of Jerusalem is proved to be the Supreme Being.

And here I cannot help recalling to your minds Mr Bagot’s declaration, that on this principle he would be

ready to maintain the proper Deity of ISAIAH and of PETER, if he found the same terms were applied to them in common with God, as he thinks is the case with respect to Christ and the Father. Now I hold him to the spirit of this declaration ; and I do so the more readily, because it will serve to show the force and cogency of those *ingenious inferences* which have been so much relied on in this discussion.

In the passage from Isaiah which I read to you a few minutes since, we find (ver. 4) that it was Isaiah who spoke to Ahaz. But in a subsequent verse (10) it appears that it must have been God himself who uttered the words ; for we read there that “JEHOVAH spake *yet again* to Ahaz,” clearly implying that it was he who had spoken before. Here then the performance of the same act is ascribed to Isaiah and to Jehovah ; consequently, on Mr Bagot’s principle, ISAIAH is JEHOVAH ! and he is bound to maintain his proper Deity !

You will remember that Mr Bagot, after showing that the term *Saviour* is applied to Christ in Scripture, referred to ISA. xliii. 11, “*I am the Lord, and beside me there is no Saviour.*” The inference—or deduction—or conclusion is, that Christ is Jehovah : of course he has *a proper Deity*. But in NEHEM. ix. 27 we read—

And in the time of their trouble, when they [the children of Israel] cried unto thee, thou heardest them from heaven ; and, according to thy manifold mercies, thou gavest them SAVIOURS, who saved them out of the hand of their enemies.

If there be any force or cogency in the former argument, *all the persons* who were SAVIOURS to the children of Israel must have been divine incarnations, and each possessed of *a proper Deity of his own* !

Again, in GEN. xlviii. 21, Joseph says, “GOD will bring you out of this land.” But in EXOD. xxxii. 7, “The LORD said unto Moses, Go ! get thee down ! for thy people which THOU broughtest out of the land of Egypt have corrupted themselves.” The same work

is thus ascribed to Moses and to God; and therefore MOSES is *perfect God and perfect man*.

The same inference follows much more strongly from EXOD. xv. 26—a passage which, I fearlessly assert, is more conclusive of the DIVINITY OF MOSES than any that has been adduced in proof of the proper Deity of the Word:

And HE [*i. e.* MOSES] SAID, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the LORD thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I AM THE LORD THY GOD!

Had such a declaration as this proceeded from the lips of Christ, how convincing a proof of his Supreme Deity it would have been held to be! Again we read in—

MATT. xix. 4, 5. *He who made them in the beginning*, made them male and female; and said, “For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh.”

“*He who made them in the beginning*” undoubtedly was God; and to him most distinctly is the sentiment ascribed by our Saviour. But we find in—

GEN. ii. 23, 24. And Adam said, . . . Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh.

In this passage the words are with equal distinctness attributed to Adam. Hence, by this “*syllogism*,” as Mr Bagot would call it, ADAM is identified with THE SUPREME BEING! I leave it to yourselves to decide whether this argument does not prove the *proper Deity of Adam* as forcibly as many of those passages adduced by Mr Bagot prove the *proper Deity of the Word*.

In EXOD. iii. 14 God said unto Moses, “I AM THAT I AM!” and in 1 COR. xv. 10 the Apostle Paul says of himself, “By the grace of God I AM THAT I AM.” Thus the same thing is asserted of Paul which is elsewhere spoken of Deity; the clear inference being that

*he is God*, if Mr Bagot's mode of making out doctrines be correct.

"*All power is given unto me*," says Christ: and this we are required to receive as a proof of his omnipotence. "*I can do all things* through Christ which strengtheneth me," says St Paul, in PHIL. iv. 13—a manifest confirmation of the former argument.

"*THOU KNOWEST ALL THINGS: thou knowest that I love thee!*" said Peter to our Saviour; thus, as Mr Bagot tells us, ascribing to him omniscience. And the Apostle John says, in his general Epistle to all Christians, "*Ye have an unction from the Holy One, AND KNOW ALL THINGS*" (1 JOHN ii. 20); so that all the members of the Church of Christ, in the time of the Apostle, were incarnations of the Deity.

Christ will judge the world: therefore, says Mr Bagot, he is God. But *the twelve Apostles* are to judge the twelve tribes of Israel, according to our Saviour's own words in MATT. xix. 28. And the Apostle Paul declares, with express reference to the Church at Corinth, "*The saints shall judge the world:*" therefore they have also *a proper Deity of their own!*

Thus by Mr Bagot's sublime logic we find that the city of Jerusalem is God—and Adam is God—and Moses is God—and the Prophet Isaiah is God—and the many Saviours of the people of Israel are God—and the twelve Apostles are God—and the members of the Church at Corinth are God—and all the Christians in the days of the Apostle John are God! Mr Bagot will, no doubt, be greatly obliged to me for supplying whatever desire he might feel for additional persons in the Godhead. If I have not found out the two whom he named in that capacity, I have discovered one of them; and I hope he will allow that I have done my best to furnish him with a respectable number of substitutes for the other. Let Mr Bagot go on: let him produce some more of his wire-drawn inferences; increase the number of these most logical deductions *ad*

*infinitum*; and then either admit that all the persons referred to have each a proper Deity of his own; or else have the openness and manliness to avow that all his scriptural *allusions*, and *inferences*, and fine-spun *deductions*, are but *empty*, *flimsy sophisms*—NOT WORTH A RUSH!

MR BAGOT.—I wish to put to Mr Porter two questions.

MR PORTER.—The rules only allow the privilege of asking one, and I will answer no more.

MR BAGOT.—Then I will propose my two questions in the form of one.

MR PORTER.—If so, I shall answer only one of them.

MR BAGOT.—I wish to ask Mr Porter, whether I did not yesterday, at the close of the meeting, offer him a list of all the texts quoted in my address, *which he declined?*

MR PORTER.—Most unquestionably you did; and I declined your offer, simply because it would have taken all the time between the close of yesterday's proceedings, and the commencement of to-day's, to hunt out and compare so many references, even without deducting any portion for sleep and other necessary refreshment.

MR BAGOT.—You may have them still, if you please.

MR PORTER.—I thank you; but I can do without them.



### THIRD DAY.

MR PORTER.—My friends, such of you as were present yesterday will recollect that I brought forward several texts embodying the main points of the Scripture doctrine of religious worship.

The first class of texts to which I adverted, as supporting my views on the subject, were those in which GOD THE FATHER *is represented by Jesus Christ as the only object of religious adoration.*

After adducing a number of examples containing the express declarations of our Saviour to this effect, I next adverted to a class of passages which proved *that our Saviour addressed his own prayers to God the Father only.*

From the influence which the precept and example of Christ ought always to have upon every person who is a member of his Church, and professes to be his disciple, I argued that we are also bound to address our worship to *God the Father only*; since we overstep his express command, and go beyond his repeated and intelligible example, when we offer up prayers to any other person or being than *God the Father*. When we do so, we deviate from our adherence to that authority with which, as Christians, we are bound to comply. Upon these two classes of texts, therefore, I might rest the whole of my argument relative to the proper object of religious worship under the Christian dispensation. I am quite sure that, to any well-regulated mind, the reasons already adduced would be decisive on the subject. If men were not unfortunately under the influence of feelings imbibed in early education; if they were not imbued from their childhood with prejudices

and prepossessions which have grown with their growth, and strengthened with their strength, until they have become part and parcel of their mental constitution; if it were not that in many cases they regard those opinions which they have long cherished as so sacred and venerable, that even to question them, and to bring them to the test of the declarations of Scripture, is often contemplated as something that is impious and awful. I am satisfied that the express teaching of Christ—the doctrine of our Lord and Saviour, sanctioned by his uniform example—would be, as it ought to be, decisive on the point.

But I have not yet done with my argument on this part of the subject. It is now my duty to lay before you a number of texts, which will show what was the influence of Christ's language and uniform example upon those persons with whom that teaching and example would carry the most religious weight. I allude to *his own immediate disciples*, who were inspired by the Spirit of God, and who were raised up and qualified for the situation of teachers and expounders of that Gospel which Christ came to promulgate. I shall now, therefore, advert to a number of—

PASSAGES WHICH PROVE THAT THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST  
ADDRESSED RELIGIOUS WORSHIP TO GOD THE FATHER  
ONLY.

In reading those passages, I shall, in order to save your time and my own, omit words that are not necessary to the connection. If, however, I leave out any expression which may appear to militate in any degree against the sense which I attribute to the phrase, or to give a different signification to the context, my reverend opponent will, doubtless, afford you the means of correcting any erroneous impression that may be thus made. This general observation I make now once for all: The words which I omit, I leave out solely because

they do not bear directly on the precise point which I have in view.

ACTS iv. 24-30. They lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, LORD, THOU ART GOD! . . . And now . . . grant . . . that signs and wonders may be done by the name *of thy holy child Jesus*.

The Apostles therefore prayed "*to God*" that signs and wonders might be done through the name "*of his holy child Jesus*." Words could not more expressly prove that Jesus, the holy child, is not himself included in that address with which the prayer commences. In this solemn act of devotion he is expressly distinguished from God.

ROM. i. 8, 9. I thank MY GOD, *through Jesus Christ*, for you all, that your faith is spoken of through the whole world; for GOD IS MY WITNESS, whom I serve with my spirit in the Gospel *of his Son*, that, without ceasing, I make mention of you always IN MY PRAYERS.

In these words also there is a manifest distinction drawn between *God* and Jesus Christ, and a proof afforded that God was not that very Christ through whom God was thanked. The Apostle does not say one word of thanking Christ by prayer. He thanks God *through Jesus Christ*. He does not call *the Son* to witness his asseverations, but *the God* whom he serves *in the Gospel of his Son*. The whole connection shows that Paul addressed his prayer *to God* alone, whom he expressly distinguishes from the Son of God.

ROM. xv. 6. . . . That ye may with one mind and one voice glorify GOD, EVEN THE FATHER *of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

What God were the Roman Christians exhorted to glorify by mind and mouth? Let the words of Paul himself answer the question, "*God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*."

EPH. i. 16, 17. I cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you *in my prayers*, that *the God of our Lord Jesus Christ*, THE FATHER OF GLORY, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom.

Observe in this passage likewise how *the God of our Lord Jesus Christ*, THE FATHER OF GLORY, and not our Lord Jesus Christ himself, is represented as the being addressed, and to be addressed, in prayer.

EPH. iii. 15, 16. For this cause I BOW MY KNEES UNTO THE FATHER OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, &c.

PHIL. iv. 6, 7. Be careful for nothing : but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known UNTO GOD ; and *the peace of God*, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds *through Christ Jesus*.

The mere reading of these passages is sufficient to prove the doctrine concerning the object of primitive Christian worship, which I am now engaged in establishing.

1 THESS. i. 2, 3. We give thanks to GOD . . . . for you, making mention of you in our prayers ; remembering without ceasing your work of faith . . . . *in our Lord Jesus Christ*, in the sight of OUR GOD AND FATHER.

In this text the same distinction is carefully preserved, which we have so often shown to exist, between " GOD THE FATHER," who was the object of prayer, and "*our Lord Jesus Christ*." Indeed, the Apostles never fell into the absurdity of praying to any other than the one God.

2 TIM. i. 2, 3. Grace, mercy, and peace, from GOD the FATHER and *Christ Jesus our Lord*. I thank GOD [ $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\upsilon\epsilon\chi\omega$ , I am grateful to God] that without ceasing I have remembered of thee in my prayers night and day.

Here also Paul makes and marks the same distinction between the Supreme Being, to whom his gratitude was expressed, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

1 JOHN iii. 22. Whatsoever we *ask*, we receive of him (God), because we keep his commandments. . . . [23.] And this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of *his Son Jesus Christ*, and love one another, as he gave us commandment.

Upon this passage we might repeat the observation so

frequently made before, that no distinction can be more clear than that which the early disciples uniformly drew between the God whom alone they worshipped and his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

As Mr Bagot has relied so much on the honours paid to Christ—which he has, in perfect consistency with one part of his theory, and in perfect opposition to another portion of it, represented as Divine Worship—it seems to me that I may usefully occupy a little of your time in giving a very brief outline of the doctrine of Scripture on that subject.

It is, I believe, admitted by divines and scholars of all sects and parties, that the term "*worship*," both in Scripture and in other compositions, is susceptible of various meanings.

In the first place, it indicates the presentation, by rational beings, of their adoration and homage to the *Most High God*. That the word has this sense admits of no doubt, nor is it denied by any one. It is needless, therefore, to adduce passages in support of it.

But there is another sense, in some respects analogous, though in other respects distinct, in which the term is frequently employed in the Sacred Volume. It often means the outward manifestation of respect and deference to a *fellow-creature* who is superior in rank, station, or endowments, to the party offering it.

Though this sense of the word is fully admitted among divines and theologians of every class, yet as Mr Bagot has throughout this discussion shown a tendency to admit nothing, how plain soever, and how freely soever allowed elsewhere, that can by possibility militate against his second proposition, I shall adduce a few arguments in proof. I find such in

JOSHUA v. 14. . . . "*As captain of the host of the LORD am I now come.*" And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and DID WORSHIP; and said unto him, "*What saith my Lord unto his servant?*" [15.] And the captain of the LORD's host said, &c.

DANIEL ii. 46. Then the king, Nebuchadnezzar, fell on his face, *and worshipped Daniel*, and said unto him, &c.

MATT xviii. 26. The servant, therefore, fell down, *and worshipped him* (the king), saying, "Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all!"

LUKE xiv. 10. *Then shalt thou have worship* in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee.

This verse shows that King James's translators understood the term "*worship*" with the latitude for which I contend. In the original the word is still stronger: it is "*glory*," δόξα; the same which is used in the song of the angels at the nativity, "Glory to God in the highest."

REV. iii. 7. And *to the angel of the Church in Philadelphia* write, . . . [9.] "Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan who say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie: behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet."

By the *angel of the Church*, most commentators agree that the pastor or bishop is designated.

1 CHRON. xxix. 20. And David said to all the congregation, "Now bless the LORD your God;" and all the congregation blessed the LORD God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, *and worshipped the LORD and the king* (προσεκύνησαν, LXX).

If this had been said of Christ, it would have been supposed to furnish an irrefragable proof of his proper Deity.

GEN. xxiii. 7. And Abraham stood up, and bowed himself (προσεκύνησε, LXX *worshipped*) to the people of the land, even to the children of Heth.

GEN. xxiii. 12. And Abraham bowed down himself before the people of the land (προσεκύνησεν, LXX *worshipped*).

GEN. xlix. 8. Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; . . . thy father's children shall bow down before thee (προσκυνήσουσι, LXX *shall worship*).

I think I have now established, by these examples, the secondary meaning of the term *worship*. If Mr Bagot deny that it has this secondary meaning, he will have an opportunity of urging his objections in his

reply. Now, the question is, Whether the worship which was several times paid to Christ, as we read in the New Testament, is of this *secondary kind*, or whether it is of that *distinctly religious nature* which is due only to the Supreme Being.

And upon this subject I shall quote to you the opinion of Dr WARDLAW, whose name, I suspect, will carry as much weight with it, in the minds of most Trinitarians, as that of Mr Bagot's bishop. It is most true, as Mr Bagot stated yesterday, that Dr WARDLAW is not *Lord Bishop of Dromore*, but simply an Independent minister in Glasgow—a dissenter from a Presbyterian establishment; and, therefore, two degrees below the humblest member in the lowest rank of an episcopal hierarchy. Yet I imagine that he is not less distinguished as a writer than the Right Rev. Dr SAURIN—who, I believe, is my reverend opponent's diocesan; but of whose contributions to science, theology, or literature, not being a universal reader, I confess I have yet to learn. Dr WARDLAW admits that, in the instances of worship paid to Christ while on earth, “the *kind* and *degree* of the intended homage cannot with certainty be ascertained.” If it cannot with certainty be ascertained, it cannot be made the foundation of an argument.

The passages which remain are those in HEB. i. 6, 2 COR. xii. 8, and several in the book of REVELATION. But be it observed, all these are instances of homage rendered *when Christ was personally present*.

In HEB. i. 6, God is represented as introducing the Son into the world, and saying, “Let all the angels worship him.” Here the Son is manifestly supposed to be one of the parties present. In 2 COR. xii. 8, the Apostle says that “*he besought the Lord thrice*” that the thorn might depart from him; and the context (verse 9) renders it highly probable that the Lord Jesus Christ is intended; but it also gives us strong reason to believe (verses 2, 3, 4) that the supplication



was presented when the Apostle was caught up into the third heaven, or "paradise," and when he had the Lord Jesus standing manifest before him. It is perfectly plain that the homage presented to the Lamb in the book of REVELATION was presented in his presence. These incidents, therefore, come precisely under the description of those that Dr WARDLAW designates as "of such a nature that the *kind* and *degree* of the intended homage *cannot with certainty be ascertained*;" because, *when he was personally present*, worship such as that referred to in the texts I have quoted—the outward testimony of respect and reverence—would naturally and properly be presented to him. Nor is there any Unitarian who would feel the least disinclination—nay, there is none who would not experience the most heart-felt delight and transport—in rendering to him this homage of their gratitude and reverence. And this, let me tell Mr Bagot and others who entertain Trinitarian views, is one of those sublime delights which we hope to enjoy in that heaven to which we humbly aspire, in firm reliance on God's mercy through Christ, and in total defiance of the denunciations of the Athanasian creed.

Mr Bagot has adduced the expression applied to Christians in the received translation of several of the Apostolic Epistles, as "*calling upon the name of the Lord*," in proof that they were in the habit of worshipping Christ. But I pledge my reputation as a scholar, that the grammatical structure will just as readily admit of rendering these passages differently from the common version; which, being made by Trinitarians, naturally favours their doctrines in most doubtful cases. They may be translated so that they will read as follows; and thus, I think, they ought to be rendered:

ACTS ix. 14. And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all *that are called by thy name*. Ver. 21. Is not this he who destroyed them *that are called by this name* in Jerusalem?

ACTS xxii. 16. Arise, and be baptised, and wash away thy sins, *taking upon thyself* his name.

1 COR. i. 2. Unto the Church of God at Corinth,—with all that in every place *are called by the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.*

I need not advert to ACTS ii. 21, because it is sufficiently clear to the attentive reader that the word “Lord” is there a synonyme for “God;” and Mr Bagot cannot assign it to Christ without assuming the very point in question between him and me in this discussion.

The only other passage to which I think it necessary to refer at length, is the circumstance recorded respecting the martyrdom of STEPHEN:

ACTS vii. 59, 60. And they stoned Stephen, invoking [that is, invoking Jesus, whom he had just before beheld in a glorious vision, standing on the right hand of God, and whom he had thus ascertained to be within hearing of his prayer] and saying, O Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.

Upon this last clause Mr Bagot seems disposed to ask, as the Jews had done before, *Who can forgive sins but God only?* To which I answer—as our Saviour did—that his miracles attested that “the Son of man has (ἐξουσίαν) a commission, or delegated authority, to forgive sins.” I may mention, moreover, that some have rendered the terms *Κύριε Ἰησοῦ*, not “O Lord Jesus,” but “O Lord of Jesus;” and that there is nothing in the grammatical structure of the phrase to militate against that translation.

The benedictions wherein the name of Christ is introduced, have been adduced as prayers presented to him by the Apostles. But they are not prayers at all. They are not addressed to him, nor to any one. They are spoken in the third person, and are merely pious and Christian wishes, expressed on behalf of the persons to whom the writings are addressed. That this is the case, is perfectly plain from 1 COR. xvi. 23, 24:

“The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. My love be with you all in Christ Jesus;” and from REV. i. 4, 5: “John, to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace be unto you, and peace from him who is, and who was, and who is to come; *and from the seven spirits*, which are before his throne; and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful Witness, and the first-begotten from the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth.” If, then, the benedictions in which the name of Christ occurs are to be regarded as proofs of his proper Deity, most unquestionably this last-quoted passage will prove that the seven ministering spirits which wait before the throne of God are likewise to be regarded as persons of the Godhead. In fact, I have not the slightest doubt that, had the writer of this book mentioned “*the Holy Spirit*” in place of “the seven spirits which are before the throne,” the passage would have been adduced as a triumphant proof of the doctrine of the Trinity. I have not time to enter upon a new argument.

---

MR BAGOT.—I will not refer to the notes which I have taken of Mr Porter’s last speech, until I have brought up my arrears by answering the remainder of the arguments which he yesterday advanced. And I shall first allude to three or four points which I consider of little weight, but upon which some persons are frequently inclined to lay considerable stress. He alluded to a long catalogue of words which have been associated with this controversy; such as “persons,” “hypostases,” “distinctions,” &c.; and he founded an argument upon the adoption of these terms by Trinitarians, against the Deity of Christ. Now, I beg to say that these words are just as good as the words “omniscience,” “omnipotence,” and “omnipresence,” which Mr Porter frequently employs to describe the knowledge, power, and presence of the Deity; and that the

latter are as unscriptural as the former. But I did not come here to argue about *words*. It has been well remarked, that "Logomachy is unworthy of a lover of truth;" and to enter upon a discussion about mere words would be a ludicrous occupation of our time. I did not come here to argue about the meaning of such terms, but about the doctrines contained in the propositions printed in the placard of the subject of discussion, and of the regulations, which have been mutually assented to; and I shall not suffer myself to be drawn beyond the confines of these propositions.

In another remark of Mr Porter's he produced a list of brother Unitarians, which I do not think there was any necessity to bring forward. He spoke of PRICE and PRIESTLEY, of BELSHAM and of BRUCE. Now, I wish to ask whether, when Mr Porter introduced the names of these individuals before this auditory, he was aware of all the sentiments which they entertained and published? Was he aware that Dr PRIESTLEY, in the *Theological Repository*, vol. iv p. 435, under the signature of "Pamphilus," published the following doctrine?

When Christ is said to have had no sin, we must restrict the meaning of the expression to his being free from overt acts of iniquity, something that all the world would condemn as base and wrong.

Was he aware that BELSHAM, in his *Calm Enquiry*, p. 190, has promulgated the following sentiment?

Whether this perfection of character in public life, combined with the general declarations of his freedom from sin, establish, or were intended to establish, the fact, that Jesus, through the whole course of his private life, was completely exempt from all the errors and failings of human nature, is a question of no great intrinsic moment, and concerning which we have no sufficient data to lead to a satisfactory conclusion.

O Christ! is it possible that intellects such as these should have arisen in the eighteenth century after thy crucifixion, to give the lie to that only problem which Jehovah and the Devil are united in substantiating by

their concurring testimony; for the everlasting Father proclaimed, at the baptism of the Saviour, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;" and Satan himself was constrained to acknowledge that he found nothing in him, and to recognise him as the holy and immaculate Son of God!

I ask, also, was Mr Porter aware, when he mentioned the name of Dr BRUCE, that respected individual who is now in this assembly, of the canon of interpreting Scripture which that writer has broached? Was he aware that Dr BRUCE lays it down as a principle, that no doctrine of Scripture is of *primary* and *essential* importance, unless it be revealed by all of the four Evangelists? Upon this principle, how easily could I yesterday have replied to Mr Porter's arguments from MARK xiii. 32, by simply saying that the doctrine of the limited knowledge of Christ is not essential, since this passage which teaches that doctrine occurs in only two of the Evangelists? But do I now enjoy the privilege of lifting up my voice to the glory of Christ within these walls, which have so frequently re-echoed to the eloquent—would that I could add the evangelical—discourses of that venerable and venerated individual! Methinks it would now impart to my soul the highest and most intense satisfaction which, as a Christian, I could experience, if God would inform me by the revelation of his Spirit that it was so ordained, in the arrangements of his providence, that the respected man to whom I refer should have survived the term of his ordinary ministerial activity, in order to have, as it were, a respite time in which he might renounce his former principles, so as to derive comfort from that sweet invitation of the Saviour, which is mentioned by only one Evangelist, "Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" and from those glorious declarations of Christ which are recorded in the 10th of JOHN, "I am the door"—"I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life

for the sheep"—“ I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine ;” and those other precious “ I AMs ” which are recorded by the beloved disciple, and which so often minister sweet consolation and encouragement to the meek and humble follower of the Lamb !

Mr Porter has asserted over and over again, that the doctrine of the Deity of Christ is so mysterious and awfully sublime in its nature, that, if true, it ought to have been written in such visible characters that he who runs may read, and to have been revealed so conspicuously as to produce immediate conviction. As to the doctrine of the Deity of Christ illuminating every page of Scripture, I maintain that, in a general sense, it does : this I have already proved, and will advance further proofs of the same. But I deny that the evidence for the Deity of Christ is of such a kind as *irresistibly* to produce conviction ; for—mark what I say !—there is a difference between evidence which is sufficient to convince, and evidence which is so overwhelming as that it must necessarily and unavoidably produce conviction. Were not, for instance, the miracles which Christ performed *sufficient* to convince the Jews that he was the Messiah ? Certainly they were. But did they in all cases *actually* produce this conviction ? Certainly they did not ; for many of the Jews rejected the testimony which he offered. So also the heavens sufficiently declare the existence of a God, yet the atheist refuses to submit to their testimony. Hence, you perceive what a difference there is between evidence being sufficient to prove a doctrine, and its actually producing conviction of the truth of that doctrine in the minds of those to whom it is addressed. I might as well argue against the Messiaship of Christ as against his Deity ; because his miracles did not produce conviction in the minds of all those who witnessed their performance. So that the actual production of conviction is not a necessary proof of the validity of an argument, or else

Christ and his apostles were bad reasoners. But let me illustrate the principle which I am now considering, by a reference to natural things. For instance, the sun which shines with majestic splendour in the expanse above is the great centre of the universe, around which the earth and all the planets revolve ; but it has been ascertained only within the last few centuries that this is the fact, and that the sun does not move round the earth. Now, might not some person have argued, on Mr Porter's principles, that a doctrine such as this, which now constitutes the elementary axiom of astronomy, ought to have been written with such perspicuity and overpowering splendour upon the visible heavens, that when Adam first opened his eyes upon the glory of creation he would have imbibed an immediate conviction of this great and important truth, so that it would not have been left exposed for centuries to the *a priori* objections of bad philosophy ? But to return to the subject itself, I ask, when Mr Porter speaks of statements respecting the Deity of Christ necessarily and irresistibly producing conviction, is he aware of what an evil heart of *unbelief* there is in man by nature ? Is he aware that as no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed, so no one can say that Jesus is the Lord (Κύριον) but by the Holy Ghost ?

I shall now make some remarks upon the texts which Mr Porter has advanced. The first I shall allude to is MATT. xxvii. 46, " My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ? " To his argument from this passage I reply, that Christ became man in order to be made a *curse* for us. Now, part of the curse consisted in losing communion with God—as Adam, when he sinned, was driven from that state of neighbourhood with God which he enjoyed in Paradise. As the Deity of Christ could not be forsaken of the Father, or lose communion with him, and could not be made a curse—for, as God, he is one with the Father—he assumed our nature in order to become capable of being made a curse in this



point of view. As to Christ's using the address, "My God, my God," it is easy to reply that, as we are told in GAL. iv. 4, he was *made* under the law, it must necessarily follow he was *made* under the Lawgiver. He became man in order to be made under the law. From eternity he was neither under the law nor under the Lawgiver; he came into a legal relationship to his Father only when he became incarnate—for mark the force of the word "made." It is also evident from JOHN xx. 17, where Christ is represented as saying, "I ascend unto my God and your God," that the words "my God" are assumed by Christ as applicable to himself in a different sense from that in which the words "your God" are applicable to Christians.

In order to obviate the force of our Saviour's declaration in JOHN x. 30, "I and my Father are one," Mr Porter referred to the prayer which he offered up on behalf of his people in JOHN xvii. 21-23:—"That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us. . . . I in them, and thou in me, that they also may be made perfect in one;" and he argued that the unity or oneness of the Son with the Father is precisely the same as that which is spoken of in the latter passage. To this argument I reply by requesting you to mark the force of the word "made," when he prays that his people "may be *made* perfect in one;" whereas he says, in reference to himself, not "I and my Father are made one," but "I and my Father *are* one;" showing that the one is a natural, the other a created union. I also reply that it is a common principle of philosophy admitted by all, that similar causes should produce similar results. If, therefore, the union between believers and the Father and the Son be the same as that which subsists between the Father and the Son, they should be able to demonstrate its sameness by a similar mode with Christ. He demonstrates the nature of his union with the Father by doing the same things which the Father does—by

quickenning whom he will, as the Father quickeneth whom he will—and by demanding that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father. Can Christians, then, quicken whom they will? Can they claim to be honoured even as the Father is honoured?—and can they do the same things which the Father doth? All these must be the natural consequences if the two unions are similar, as like causes must produce like results. But as no one can have the hardihood to say that all these powers and prerogatives are possessed by every member of the Church of Christ, Mr Porter's argument consequently goes for nothing. Would that he experienced something of that delightful fellowship with the Father and the Son which every humble believer enjoys; and he would then have an experimental interpretation within his own breast of what the Saviour means when he prays that his people may be one in him and his Father, even as he and his Father are one!

In the last address which Mr Porter delivered yesterday he proposed this question, How could the eternal God divest himself of his inherent and essential glory, and come down into a state of humiliation upon the earth? I ask, in reply, when did I teach such a doctrine? So far from delivering such an opinion, I hold that no *change* can take place in the essential majesty and glory of Jehovah. When an eclipse of the sun is produced by the intervention of the opaque body of the moon, is the sun shorn of his brightness and his splendour? Does he not *still* continue elevated upon his throne of glory—the same bright monarch of the material universe as when, fresh from his Maker's hands, he disclosed, by his new-born lustre, the engaging loveliness of creation? And so it was when the godhead of the Saviour tabernacled in the flesh: there took place, as it were, an eclipse of his divinity—the veil of his humanity was drawn over the greatness of his essential glory: and all this was done in compliance

with the infirmities of our nature ; for had the Saviour *appeared* with a full manifestation of his essential godhead, as no man can look upon the face of Deity and live, our vital spirits would have been not merely absorbed, but annihilated by a lustre they never could have borne. And as to describing the Saviour's manifestation in the flesh by the phrase of "coming down from heaven," I should wish to know what Mr Porter understands by the declaration contained in GEN. xi. 5: "Jehovah *came down* to see the city and the tower which the children of men builded ;" for is not this passage as plausible an argument against the Deity of Jehovah as a similar form of description *can* be against the Deity of Christ ?

I now proceed to consider the remarks which Mr Porter has made upon ISA. vii. 14, "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign : behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel." And how did Mr Porter meet my argument for the Deity of Christ from this passage ? He placed an uninspired work, written by Bishop LOWTH, in juxtaposition with the authority of the inspired Evangelist MATTHEW, and actually attributed a higher degree of authority to the former. In answer to this I refer you to MATT. i. 22, 23 : "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us." Now, mark the mode in which MATTHEW introduces this prophecy. He does not merely say, "*Then was fulfilled,*" but "*All this was done that it might be fulfilled.*" Whether the former phrase might or might not have been accounted for as merely indicating an allusion to the prophecy, upon the loose principle of accommodation adopted by Unitarians, the latter phrase cannot be *so* explained away. This introduction, therefore, "All this was done that it might be fulfilled,"

clearly proves that the fact referred to is the *actual* and *precise* accomplishment of the prophecy about to be quoted. But let me keep the Hebrew of ISAIAH out of view altogether, and argue from MATTHEW's interpretation of the name Emmanuel. He explains this designation as implying that Christ is "God with us" ( $\mu\epsilon\theta' \eta\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu \delta \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ , in which the proposition  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$  denotes personal presence), which explicitly asserts his Deity. And whilst I am engaged with this passage I would beg you to consider it in contrast with ZECH. xiii. 7 : "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts." The words rendered "the man that is my fellow" might be rendered "the man that is with me ;" and I would add that the Hebrew term translated "fellow" is of the same root as the word translated "Emmanuel," in ISA. vii. 14. And now observe the contrast—a human creature speaks of Christ (as in ISA. vii. 14 and MATT. i. 23) as "God with us ;" whereas God the Father speaks of Christ (as in ZECH. xiii. 7) as "the man with him." So that we have here, on the one hand, the testimony of an inspired Prophet and Evangelist to the *Deity* of Christ, and, on the other hand, the testimony of Jehovah the Father to the *humanity* of Christ.

The next passage to which Mr Porter alluded was ISA. ix. 6 : "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given ; and the government shall be upon his shoulder ; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, THE MIGHTY God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." But in his remarks upon this text he overlooks the title "Mighty God" altogether. I therefore beg to remark that this is a proper title of Jehovah, as distinguished from all false gods, as is evident from the following passages : DEUT. x. 17, "The Lord your God is a *mighty God*," &c. ; ISA. x. 21, "The remnant shall return unto *the Mighty God*," &c. ; NEH. ix. 32, "Now, therefore, our God, the Great, *the Mighty*," &c. ; JER. xxxii. 18, "The Great, *the Mighty God*, the

Lord of hosts, is his name," &c. So that, whatever principle Mr Porter may adopt in order to neutralise the force of this title when applied to Christ in ISA. ix. 6, will, by a parity of reasoning, dilute and neutralise its import when applied to Jehovah in these four passages to which I have referred. But, however, he asserted that there is no authority for applying ISA. ix. 6 to the Saviour. In reply to this, I beg to refer him to MATT. iv. 14, 16, where the previous context of this passage (ver. 1 and 2) are expressly quoted as having their fulfilment in the personal ministry of Christ: "The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles: the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up."

But while I am occupied with this passage of Scripture, I wish to make a remark which applies both to it and to other passages which contain a description of the Saviour's person. I hold that the person of Christ, *as Mediator*, is a *complex* person—God and man. I therefore expect to find, when I open the Bible, that those passages which contain a description of his person should be of a *complex* structure, corresponding with the complexity of the person described. For instance, in ISA. ix. 6 I find this to be the case; for the first two clauses of the passage, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given," describe his *humanity*; and the remainder of the verse describes his *Deity*. So also in MAL. iii. 1, he is first described, in reference to his *Deity*, as "the Lord coming to *his* temple;" then he is described, in reference to his mediatorial character, as "the Messenger of the covenant;" and then these two references to the condition of the Saviour are combined into one personal reference by the use of the pronoun "he" in the concluding member of the verse—"even *he* shall come, saith the Lord of hosts." So also in HEB. i. 8, 9, we find another complex de-

scription of his complex person; for the 8th verse refers to his *Deity*—"Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;" and the 9th verse refers to his *humanity*, in reference to which it is said—"Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, *even thy God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness *above thy fellows*." Now, when I read this portion of the word of God, I do not apply to its interpretation Mr Porter's principle, which he has borrowed from the algebraic doctrine of positive and negative quantities. I do not employ the 9th verse in order to neutralise the 8th. *I believe both declarations to be true.*

Mr Porter yesterday maintained, in order to weaken my argument from the application of the title "God" to Christ, that this title is frequently given in Scripture to confessedly created beings. In reply to this, I answer that, admitting it to be the fact, yet if it weakens or dilutes the force of my arguments for the Deity of the Son, from the application of this title to him, it must, on a similar principle, weaken the force of the argument for the Deity of the Father, derived from the application of the title "God" to him. As an instance of this subordinate use of the title God, Mr Porter referred to Exod. vii. 1: "And the Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee (or appointed thee) a God (or Elohim) to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet. Thou shalt speak all that I command thee." But upon this text I remark, that it is quite absurd to place it on a level with the instances of the application of the title "God" to Christ, which I have adduced. Here the *official* sense in which Moses was to be made a "God" is *limited* to Pharaoh, and *explained* to mean that in *the same sense* in which Aaron was to be a prophet to Moses, so was Moses to be a "God" to Pharaoh. And so far from the application of the term implying the investiture of Moses with anything like an independent authority, power, or prerogative, it is expressly stated that Moses was "to

speak all that God commanded him." And on reverting to EXOD. iv. 16, we find a passage precisely parallel to this, which gives it this explanation: "And he (Aaron) shall be thy spokesman unto the people: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him *instead* of God." But I ask, was Moses *in the habit* of acting as if he were a Deity? Surely not: and I may remark that, when on one solitary occasion he had spoken unadvisedly with his lips, and had thereby abstracted from the glory of Jehovah, he became the subject of the Divine displeasure, and was excluded from the promised land, as a punishment of his presumption. The commands of Moses were always prefaced by "*thus saith Jehovah*," and "*Jehovah hath commanded me*." Christ, on the other hand, never adopted this style of inferiority: he never says, "*thus saith Jehovah*:" he always acts and speaks upon his own authority, and in all things exhibits himself to his creatures as Lord of all. Observe, for instance, the language which he adopted in the Sermon on the Mount: "Ye have heard that it hath been said *to them* of old time (for so it is in the Greek), thou shalt not steal; *but I say unto you*." Here he contrasts *his* legislative authority with that of Jehovah delivering the ten commandments to the Israelites.

The next instances of an alleged application of the term "God" to creatures, to which Mr Porter referred, were in EXOD. xxi. 6: "Then his master shall bring him unto the judges" (in the Hebrew it is "Elohim"); and 1 SAM. ii. 25: "If one man sin against another, the judge (in Hebrew, "Elohim") shall judge him." In both of these passages Mr Porter asserted that the term "Elohim," or "God," is applied to the judges of Israel. *I deny this*; and I assert that no proper instance of the application of this title to the judges can be adduced. Does not Mr Porter know that the Jewish government was a THEOCRACY?—that God himself was Judge and King? and that *he* was ever re-



garded as presiding in the Jewish courts of law? And if you look to EXOD. xviii. 14-19, you will find the judicial process explained upon this principle: "And when Moses' father-in-law saw all that he did to the people, he said, What is this thing that thou doest to the people? Why sittest thou thyself alone, and all the people stand by thee from morning unto evening? And Moses said unto his father-in-law, Because the people come unto me *to inquire of God*. When they have a matter, they come unto me, and I judge between one and another; and I do make them know *the statutes of God, and his laws*. . . . Be thou for the people to Godward, *that thou mayest bring the causes unto God*." So that, upon the principle that God was Judge and King, whenever an Israelite brought his cause into the court, he was considered as bringing it before the great Judge and King. I would here add, that the word "Elohim," in both the passages under consideration, is translated in the Septuagint as denoting the Supreme Being; and the Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic versions of 1 SAM. ii. 25, translate "Elohim," not as "Judge," but as the "Supreme God." And these authorities are at least as good as Mr Porter's.

But let me a little farther examine this objection, derived from the application of the title "God" to creatures. *If* this title were given by MANOAH and his wife, when their feelings were overwhelmed with fright and alarm, to a created angel, am I to set up such authority as this against the authority of the Holy Ghost who applies the same title to Christ? Or, if I find the witch of Endor, when terrified by an apparition, giving the title of "God" to a fictitious or real being, am I to confront this fact with the instances of the application of the same title by the Holy Spirit to our Saviour in JOHN i. 1, and HEB. i. 8, and thus set up the authority of a witch against the authority of the Holy Ghost? Again: when I adduce in argument the two instances of an application to Christ of the titles "King of kings,

and Lord of lords," which are recorded in REV. xvii. 14, and xix. 16, and which are the same as those applied to the Father, upon Mr Porter's principles, in 1 TIM. vi. 15, I am answered, forsooth, as I have been answered, that the argument is worth nothing, because Artaxerxes *styled himself* "King of kings." But I answer, If Artaxerxes chose to give himself the nickname of "King of kings"—if he chose, in the pride of his heart, to set up his authority against the authority of God—am I to admit this as a parallel case with the ascription of the title of "King of kings" by the Holy Ghost to our Saviour? Does the Holy Ghost, do you think, apply the titles of "King of kings, and Lord of lords," as nicknames to our Saviour? But I am driven almost upon the very verge of blasphemy, in endeavouring to answer such arguments as I am now referring to! I shall conclude this point by reading a note upon the subject, to the following effect:—The simple and correct way of trying the value of the objections advanced against the Deity of Christ from the application of the name of "God" to *confessedly* created beings, is to examine the alleged instances by a plain grammatical principle, which is this: *That we are always to understand words in that sense in which the speaker or writer employs them, and then to decide upon the correctness of that sense according to the competency of the judgments of those who so employ the words in question.* Now, apply this principle to PSALM lxxxii. 6, 7: "I have said, Ye are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High; but ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes." Here we at once perceive that the Psalmist has used the term in an *ironical*—or, I might say, in a *ludicrous* sense. Apply the principle also to 1 COR. viii. 5: "Though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth (as there be gods many, and lords many)." Here it is evident that the Apostle is speaking of those who were gods *in the estimation of their worshippers*; and we know that the

Heathen were grossly incorrect in their use of the word "God." ON THE OTHER HAND, apply the same principle to JOHN i. 1: "The Word was God;" or to ROM. ix. 5: "Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." In these instances, we find the Holy Ghost, by the instrumentality of the Apostles, giving the title "God" to Christ; and we cannot suppose that he gives the title to him in an *ironical* sense, or in a *subordinate* sense (for in each passage there are concomitant expressions, which show that the title is used in its strict and proper sense). Thus, the question resolves itself into this: Are we to suppose that the Holy Ghost was an incompetent judge as to the correct application of this title? Are we to reject *his* testimony as to the Deity of the person to whom he thus gives the name of God, in the same manner as we reject the testimony of the Heathen as to the Deity of those real or fictitious creatures to whom they gave the title? The answer is easy; and this view of the subject places it in its proper light.

I would also remark, that the Greek word Θεός is not represented in the New Testament as being applied, *by any competent* authority, to any confessedly created being; and also, that the contrast instituted by Unitarians between passages in which the title "God" is applied to creatures, and those in which it is applied to Christ, might as well be instituted between the same, and those passages in which it is applied to the Father. Why should our opponents be allowed the advantage of a tacit admission, that the title is applied in every case, in a strictly proper sense, to the Father? *We do not deny the true Deity of the Father*; but we fairly argue, that every objection advanced against the Deity of the Son, is an equally valid objection against the Deity of the Father.

Mr Porter next referred to JER. xxiii. 5, 6: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign

and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely ; and this is his name whereby *he* shall be called, THE LORD (or JEHOVAH) OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." In order to evade the argument for the Deity of Christ which I derived from the application to him of the name "Jehovah," in this passage, Mr Porter argued that I might as well believe in the Deity of Jerusalem, because the same title is applied to that city in JER. xxxiii. 15, 16: "In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of Righteousness to grow up unto David ; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely ; and this is the name wherewith *she* shall be called, THE LORD (or JEHOVAH) OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." I would like to know if Mr Porter has forgotten his Hebrew ? Is he not aware that the words, "she shall be called," in the latter passage, are a mistranslation ? He said a good deal in the course of this discussion upon the subject of bad translations ; but he has not hesitated to argue from a mistranslation when he considered it to be in his favour, and suitable to the defence of his opinions. Allow me, now, to give the true rendering of this passage. It may be either translated thus, "And *He* who shall call her is Jehovah our Righteousness ;" or thus, "This is the name whereby *He* shall be called (or by which one shall call him) Jehovah, our Righteousness." The latter translation is adopted by the VULGATE and the SYRIAC version, and is constructed on the principle of understanding the personal pronoun  $\text{ה}$ , to be the *masculine in the Chaldaic form*, which is of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament. Dr PRE SMITH's translation of this passage is as follows :

"And this is He who shall call to her,  
Jehovah our Righteousness."

I may here remark, in addition to the above, that the

passage extending from verse 14 to 26 is wanting in the Aldine, Vatican, and Alexandrine copies of the Septuagint; but in two MSS. it stands thus—

1. Καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα ὃ κληθήσεται, Κύριος δικαιοσύνη ἡμῶν: “This the name which shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.”

1. Καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα ὃ καλέσει αὐτήν, Κύριος δίκαιος συν ἡμῶν: “And this the name which he shall call her, the righteous Lord with us;” understanding the last word in this latter version to be a commemorative indication of the presence of the righteous Lord with his Church.

---

MR PORTER.—I will exercise my privilege of putting a question to Mr Bagot, to which I hope to receive, what I have not yet received on former occasions, a plain and direct answer. Mr Bagot has asserted in the hearing of you all, that in order to enable Christ to exercise and execute the functions of his office, it was necessary that he should lose communion with God; and, therefore, that he did lose communion with God. I now ask Mr Bagot, How did Christ lose communion with God, without being sinful?

MR BAGOT.—My words were simply these: Christ assumed human nature, in order that he might, in reference to that human nature, become capable of losing communion with God; for, in reference to his divine nature, he could not lose communion with God.

MR PORTER.—My friends, if I was desirous to signalise myself as a master of declamation, I should be obliged to Mr Bagot for the speech now delivered; for never was there a fairer opportunity afforded to man of showing how completely an opponent's own statements could be retorted on himself than that which is now presented to me. What a display might I not now make, if I could descend to the arts of vulgar oratory

in the advocacy of my cause! But to such means I never shall resort.

I must strongly object to Mr Bagot's introduction of the name of that venerable man before us (Dr BRUCE), my predecessor and my friend. I object to this allusion as being personal to one who had no opportunity of speaking for himself, to correct what might be a misrepresentation of his sentiments, or to set himself right before this assembly. It was unkind and uncourteous, on the part of Mr Bagot, to take advantage of the accidental circumstance of our carrying on this discussion within these walls, in order to make a clap-trap allusion to that venerable man. Such acts may have their effect on a few unthinking minds; but every one of sense and understanding will disregard them. I might have taken advantage of the circumstance of my being the Minister who usually addresses a congregation from this place, in order to give effect to my arguments; but I would not do so, because I disdain such arts. I felt from the first that the allusion in question was irregular; but I did not interrupt Mr Bagot: for I would not have it said that I, or the venerable individual whom he has so unhandsomely dragged before you, had anything to fear from all that he could say.

Mr Bagot quoted two passages from PRIESTLEY and BELSHAM, in which these writers have expressed their opinions of the possibility of the sinfulness of Christ's human nature; but after the answer which he has given to my question, I leave it to yourselves to judge whether such allusions are serviceable to his cause. Has not Mr Bagot himself declared, that "*Christ lost communion with God?*" Never did I hear from the lips of a Unitarian—never before did I hear—such an aspersion cast upon the Lord Jesus! Oh! if such an expression had proceeded from the lips of a Unitarian, or had been ushered into the world by a Unitarian press, or by a Unitarian writer, how the apostasy would have been trumpeted forth, and how its authors would

have been held up to execration, as persons utterly unworthy of enjoying either part or lot in the advantages of Christian fellowship !

Mr Bagot, after very charitably imputing to me, and to those who agree with me, "*an evil heart of unbelief*," proceeded to offer up a prayer similar to that which he presented on behalf of my venerable friend—a prayer which I would characterise, as ROBERT HALL did one by Bishop HORSLEY, as offered up to the throne of grace in the spirit of an indictment. After this charitable prayer, he naturally enough proceeded to misrepresent what I delivered in my address of yesterday, in a way that I did not expect. In my closing address of yesterday, the greater part of which I happily had previously written down, so that I am able from the paper before me to read the exact words which I employed, I made the following statement respecting the reasoning of Mr Bagot in support of the *proper Deity of the Word*, from the supposed application of divine names and titles to our Saviour.

"The first argument was drawn from the term IMMANUEL, found in ISA. vii. 14, and applied to our Saviour in MATT. i. 23. To understand the perfect emptiness of this argument, it is only necessary to read the passage in ISAIAH with its context ; which I shall do from the version of Bishop LOWTH, as being much more accurate than that contained in King James' translation.

#### "CHAP. VII.

"In the days of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, the son of," &c. These were my very words. Yet you have seen and heard how Mr Bagot asserted that I poised the BIBLE in one hand, and Bishop LOWTH in the other ; and that I weighed the authority of LOWTH against the authority of Scripture, and gave the preponderance to the former. Now I ask, is this fair ? Did I not appeal to the authority of *Scripture*, and of Scripture alone ? It is true, I am above pinning my faith on King James' translation as a critical standard. I took LOWTH's as being the best translation I could procure. It was to



the Scriptures, however, that I appealed, and not to LOWTH. I have done so no more, in this instance, than he has done in a variety of others, when he adduced other authorities against the renderings of the (so called) authorised version of the Bible. In the present case, it is quite manifest that I no more appealed to LOWTH against the authority of Scripture, than he appealed to King James' translators in opposition to the authority of Scripture: the two cases are perfectly parallel.

Mr Bagot has told us that the *name* which occurs in ISA. ix. 6, and is there translated "THE MIGHTY GOD," is in the original, אֱלֹהִים (EL-GiBboR), a title which elsewhere designates the Supreme Being. I know it is. And what does this circumstance prove? The words, though arranged in a different order, are just the same that make up the name of the angel GaBRi-EL, which has precisely the same signification. Was this celestial messenger, then, really God Most High? If so, he may be put down as another of the persons in Mr Bagot's multifarious divinity.

As I have already said, if I chose to signalise myself by argumentative dexterity, Mr Bagot has given me the opportunity: but I am more anxious to explain to you the clear evidence for the truth, as it is found recorded in the page of revelation, than to obtain for myself the character of an adroit debater or a popular declaimer. I shall, therefore, leave several of the points on which he has touched to make whatever impression they may seem calculated to produce. There is one allusion, to which, as my reverend opponent has repeated it several times, he seems to attach considerable importance; and which, for this reason, I shall now briefly examine. The allusion is to the passage which occurs in HEB. i. 8; which, in the common version, reads thus:

But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God! is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.

Now, it is not to be denied that, according to this translation of the passage, the term *God* is applied to Christ, the Son. But I would leave to any unprejudiced person, who should merely read over the whole of the chapter with care, and should attend to the expressions which accompany this verse, to determine whether the phrase is, or is not, applied to him in the highest sense, by the Sacred Writer. The mere reading of the preceding and subsequent verse will suffice to render this clear.

HEB. i. 7-9. And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But unto [or *of*] the Son [he saith], Thy throne, O God! is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, **EVEN THY GOD**, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness *above thy fellows*.

“God—even *thy God*—hath anointed thee;” therefore the person who is addressed as God in the preceding verse had *a God above him*, and consequently could not be the Supreme Deity, nor God in the strictest sense of the word. “God hath *anointed thee with the oil of gladness*,” therefore the person addressed in the 8th verse could not be the Everlasting Divinity: for who could anoint the Supreme Being with the oil of gladness? Who could increase that felicity which is at every moment, and has been from all eternity, perfect and complete? “God—even *thy God*—hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness *above thy fellows*,” therefore the person addressed in the 8th verse could not be the Supreme Being, who reigns without a rival and without an equal. This argument is so plain that even Mr Bagot, with all his ingenuity, will not be able to turn it aside. But to make it still more obvious, I refer you to—

PSALM xlv. 5, 6. Thy throne, O God! is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, therefore God, *thy God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Here we find the very words on which Mr Bagot so much relies as proving the proper deity of the Word, applied to a person who, from several expressions in the psalm, appears to be Solomon, in a composition which is entitled “A Song of Loves;” that is, an *epithalamium* or *amatory poem*. I shall only state that the commencing clause in HEB. i. 8, and in PSALM xlv. 6, may in both places be very properly translated “God is *thy throne* for ever and ever;” an expression which is similar to those wherein God is spoken of as a *tower*, a *fortress*, and a *shield*; and that it is probably applied both to Solomon and to our Lord, simply to denote the stability and continuance of their respective kingdoms.

I shall now proceed to lay before you the remaining proofs that the Scriptures uniformly represent the Son of God as subordinate to God, the Father; and in the first place I shall demonstrate that—

THE TITLES WHICH ARE GIVEN IN SCRIPTURE TO OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, ARE SUCH AS DECIDEDLY PROVE HIS INFERIORITY TO THE FATHER.

1. He is called “*the Word*;” and this term is believed by those who suppose that in him two natures are united to denote the highest of them.

JOHN i. 1. In the beginning was *the Word*, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

JOHN i. 14. And *the Word* was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory of the only-begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

These two verses, which occur in the same context, afford the only instance that I have been able to find in which the term *Word* can, even by possibility, be supposed to be applied to Christ in any sense. On the former passage I have already commented at sufficient length: I confine myself on this occasion to a very few remarks on the latter. It asserts that “*the Word*”

was made flesh : and “*the Word*,” as Mr Bagot intimates, is the proper and descriptive name for Christ’s divine nature. Was, then, *the Divine nature* made flesh ? Was the *Deity* converted into *manhood* ? This the text affirms, if the meaning attributed to *the Word* be correctly stated. But this is a doctrine which even the orthodox repudiate ; the term *Word*, therefore, cannot in this passage admit of the signification supposed. Was the eternal Majesty of heaven *made* (ἐγένετο) flesh ? Well did Mr Bagot declare that it is difficult not to trespass beyond the proper limits when stating views such as those now adverted to. But in truth, not only does the term *Word* not denote the supreme deity of the person to whom it is applied, but no term could be employed more clearly expressing the very contrary : for none can more distinctly proclaim that one being is inferior to another, than when the former is declared to be *the word* of the latter. You will observe that in JOHN i. 14 it is not declared that the SUPREME BEING *took* man’s nature into union with his own ; but simply that THE WORD *was made* or *became* flesh. Now that the *Word* is itself a name of inferiority, I shall prove by simply reading to you the meanings of the term Λόγος (*Word*), as given by the celebrated Trinitarian lexicographer, SCHLEUSNER, in his Lexicon to the New Testament. They are as follows :—

A word spoken, a speech, an oration (short or long), a written discourse, a writing, a book (more especially *historical*), a narrative of a fact, a story (true or false), a report, a rumour, a precept, a mandate, a testimony, an oracle, a vaticination, a prophecy, a promise, a threat, a commination, a proverb, an adage, a popular opinion or sentiment, a question, a controversy, a subject of discussion, a suit at law, a cause to come before a judge, a calumny, a reproach, a blasphemy, a doctrine taught, an instruction, a mode or plan of teaching, the power of speaking and teaching ; a *teacher*, [N.B. To this meaning, SCHLEUSNER refers JOHN i. 1, JOHN i. 14, and 1 JOHN v. 7 ;] the profession of the Christian religion, the subject of discourse, an account to be rendered of any act

or fact in words, an account rendered of anything given and received ; a cause ; a reason ; the estimation in which anything is held ; an affair, a fact, a business ; a trade, a commerce ; equity, justness, fairness ; the apparent and outward seeming of anything, as opposed to fact and truth. Sometimes it is superfluous ; sometimes it is omitted.

Such is the signification of that term which Mr Bagot tells us is the proper name of the supreme deity of Christ. After reading the list, am I not authorised to ask whether any term could have been found more inadequate to express the idea which his theory affixes to it ?

2. Our Lord is called the "Child of God" in Scripture three times ; the "Son of God," or "the Son," ninety-three times at least ; "God's *own* Son, *dear* Son, *beloved* Son, or *only-begotten* Son," fifteen times. The passages being so numerous, I refer you to CRUDEN'S or any other good Concordance for the places wherein they occur.

Now, I argue that every instance wherein one of these names is to be found is a proof of the inferiority of the person to whom it is applied. The phrases, "*Son*," "*Son of God*," &c., as applied to our Lord, are no doubt metaphorical ; but yet they clearly and strongly express the priority of the Father—the origination of the Son as opposed to self-existence, and his inferiority to his Father in wisdom, dignity, and authority. It appears, then, that Christ's filial relation to God is expressed in Scripture about one hundred and ten times ; while he is not called God oftener than *twice* or *thrice*, and in every instance with marks which show that the name is given to him only in a general or inferior sense. It is plain that the Father must exist before the Son, and that the Son derives his existence from the Father ; and both these circumstances are irreconcilable with the alleged proper deity of the Son. If, indeed, the writers of Scripture had known our Lord Jesus Christ to be the Supreme Being, why would they

so repeatedly and habitually give him a name which so distinctly implies inferiority?

The terms *Father* and *Son*, as applied to God and our Saviour, denote indeed the mutual affection which subsists between them; and bestowed, as the phrase *Son of God* is in Scripture, emphatically on our Lord, it signifies, unquestionably, that he enjoyed a distinguished degree of regard and affection on the part of the Supreme Being. But this is no more than every Unitarian believes; and, certainly, no denomination could more inadequately denote the Supreme Being. Yet this is the very word which is almost uniformly employed in human creeds, catechisms, and liturgies, to express his godhead. In such compositions we read repeatedly of "*God the Son*;" a phrase which cannot be pointed out in Scripture, but which occurs in that prayer which Mr Bagot recites every Sunday—"O God, the Son, Redeemer of the World," &c. Let it be remembered that the phrase "Son of God" is attributed to many other beings whose deity never was alleged. Thus we read that, on the completion of the material creation, "all the sons of God" (*i.e.*, the angels) "shouted for joy." The Jews, under the Old Testament dispensation, are called "children of the Most High." And under the New Covenant Christians are reminded of the love which the Father has showed unto us, that we should be called "the Sons of God." A phrase which can be so extensively applied certainly affords no intimation of the supreme deity of him to whom it is applied.

3. Our blessed Lord is called an Apostle once; a High Priest eleven times; a Prophet nineteen times. All these terms denote of themselves his inferiority to God. The manner in which these titles are given to Christ in the New Testament confirms this inference.

HEB. iii. 1. Consider the *Apostle* and *High Priest* of our pro-

fession ; Christ Jesus, who was *faithful* to him *that appointed him*, as also *Moses was faithful*.

“*A High Priest*” can scarcely be regarded as denoting a divine person. In this passage our Saviour is represented as *an Apostle* and as *a High Priest*, who was *appointed to those offices* in the same manner and by the same authority to which Moses owed his selection ; and who was, like him, *faithful* to his superior. Subordination could not be more clearly expressed. For the other examples of the use of these phrases, I must, as before, refer to the Concordance, in which they will readily be found. Among the instances wherein our Lord is called a Prophet in the New Testament, I refer you to his own words in—

LUKE xiii. 33. It cannot be that *a Prophet* perish out of Jerusalem.

These words he spoke in anticipation of his death. He is also called by the same title in—

LUKE xxiv. 19. Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people.

And if it be alleged that this expression fell from two of his disciples before the communication of the Holy Ghost, I refer to—

ACTS iii. 22-23. For Moses truly said unto the fathers, “*A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me : him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.*”

In these three passages Christ is freely compared even to human agents, and is expressly called by a title that is frequently attributed to certain of them—*a Prophet* : a most extraordinary name whereby to designate the Supreme Being !

4. Our Lord is several times in Scripture called *a Man* ; and this not by his enemies merely, nor by the Jewish people alone, but by himself, and by inspired



prophets and faithful apostles. Nor is the title given to him only in one branch or department of his supposed compound nature, but in such a way as to show that it was given to him in his entire capacity. Indeed, the distinction between the two natures of Christ, to which Mr Bagot and other Trinitarians so frequently have recourse, is perfectly gratuitous and unfounded ; an assumption unknown to the inspired writers and early teachers of the Word of God. On this subject, I shall probably make a few remarks before the close of this discussion.

ISA. liii. 3. He is despised and rejected of men ; *a man* of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.

JOHN i. 30. After me cometh *a man* who is preferred before me : for he was before me.

These words of John the Baptist may be understood as referring either to the superior authority of Christ, or simply to his pre-existence. To the latter mode of interpreting the verse, and to the doctrine which it involves, I am, as I have already stated, inclined ; although I admit my theory is accompanied with some difficulties.

JOHN iv. 29. Come (said the woman of Samaria), see *a man* who told me all things that ever I did. Is not this the Christ?

LUKE xxiv. 19. Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet, &c.

I quote this passage again, because the words of the original are, *a man prophet* ; which may be translated in accordance with a Greek idiom of frequent occurrence, either a *human prophet*, or a *prophetic man*. Our Saviour did not scruple to apply the same language to himself on various occasions, as in—

JOHN viii. 40. But now ye seek to kill me, *a man* that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God.

Nor did his disciples, as in the words of Peter—

ACTS ii. 22. Ye men of Israel, hear these words : Jesus of Nazareth, *a man* approved among you by signs and wonders, which God did in the midst of you through him, &c.

The reading of these words suggests a question, to which I should gladly receive an answer. In what one of all the addresses of all the Apostles to their countrymen and to the heathen did any one of them ever make the slightest mention of the supposed Deity of Christ? According to the popular representations, we might imagine that the Apostles, when they went forth to publish salvation to the world, forgot the great object of their teaching. Certain it is, that they dropped not one word on the subject of Christ's divinity. They had not learned in the school of modern orthodoxy. Had they gone forth in the spirit of modern preaching, they would have been heard to speak loudly and largely of Jesus as "God and man," and "*the incarnate God*" and "God-man;" and they might have been heard to speak—in the language of Wesley's Hymn-Book, if I mistake not—of the agonies of the Deity *expiring on the cross!* But none of these things did or could the Apostles announce to their contemporaries; because they are modern discoveries, of which they themselves required to be informed.

ACTS xvii. 30, 31. God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, through that *man* whom he hath ordained.

Mr Bagot argued that the office of executing judgment required all the attributes of Deity: but here we find the office is *assigned* to Christ,—and assigned to him, not in his divine, but in his human nature. "God will judge the world through *that man* whom he hath ordained." These are the words of Paul to the Athenians. Choose ye now between his authority and that of my reverend opponent.

Our Lord is called a man in several other passages; among which I shall now adduce only—

1 COR. xv. 21. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.

5. He is called the "*Son of man*"—a designation which unquestionably marks his inferiority to God—by others at least five times ; by himself upwards of seventy times. For the particular passages I must again refer you to the Concordance.

6. He is called "*the Sent*" of God—or, which is the same thing in effect, God is declared to have sent him—at least fifty-six times ; a mode of speech which is perfectly inconsistent with the doctrine of his supposed Deity. *Fifty-six* times God is declared in Scripture to have *sent him*. If this does not mark his inferiority, I know not what does. Remember his own words : "The servant is not greater than his Lord, neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him ;" a declaration which, in the Jewish idiom, means to affirm strongly and pointedly that the servant is *less* than his Lord, and the person sent *inferior* to him by whom he is sent. Now our Lord is said to have been *sent by the Father* in—

JOHN iv. 14. We have seen, and do testify, that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.

The Father therefore is superior to the Son. Our Lord even compares his own mission, received from the Father, to that of his Apostles, received from himself.

JOHN xx. 21. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you. As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.

JOHN xvii. 18. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so send I them into the world.

This last passage occurs in that solemn prayer on which Mr Bagot has commented so ingeniously, and several expressions of which he thinks must have been spoken by our Lord in his *divine* capacity. Think of the Divinity offering up a prayer ! But to this the views of Trinitarians necessarily lead. See farther—

JOHN viii. 42. Neither came I of myself, but he (that is God) sent me.

7. He is called a *Mediator* four times; and *the Christ*, or *the Anointed*, upwards of three hundred times. Now Mr Bagot expressly allows that the term *Mediator* does, in itself, imply inferiority to one of the parties between whom he mediates. He was not therefore a divine Mediator, according to his own showing, but one who is inferior to Divinity. Observe also that the term Mediator is not confined to our Saviour in Scripture; for Moses is called by that title, by no less an authority than the Apostle Paul, in GAL. iii. 19, [The law] “was ordained by angels in the hand of a *Mediator*,” and the expression is virtually repeated in the next verse, where, in reference to the foregoing declaration, it is added, “Now a *mediator* is not a mediator of one; but God is one.” And that the term *Christ* (*the Anointed*) does in itself imply inferiority, is obvious from—

ACTS x. 38. GOD *anointed* Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power.

Now as no person whatsoever could possibly anoint the Almighty with the Holy Spirit and with power, it follows that he who is *the Anointed*, or *the Christ*, is inferior to God. And a passage which puts this beyond all question is—

ACTS ii. 36. GOD hath *made* Jesus both Lord and *Christ*.

Our Saviour, therefore, derived his unction, or the appointment to his office as the *Christ*, from God; and this shows that wherever the term Christ is found, it is to be considered as a declaration of his inferiority to the Father. Now, as I have already stated, it is applied to our Lord upwards of three hundred times.

I shall now adduce as many as my time will permit of a numerous class of—

TEXTS IN WHICH IT IS EXPRESSLY DECLARED THAT CHRIST WAS CREATED BY THE FATHER, AND RECEIVED FROM HIM HIS EXISTENCE, WISDOM, POWER, AUTHORITY, AND GLORY.

As connected with this subject, it may be observed that when the Apostle Paul speaks in the loftiest terms he ever employs, with reference to the dignity and pre-eminence of the Saviour of men, he not only gives to him the title "*Son*," which in itself implies inferiority, but he speaks of him as "*the first-born of all creation*;" and since the first-born of every family is always a member of that family, so the *first-born of creation* must be himself *a creature*—that is to say, *a created being*. The passage to which I allude is to be found in—

COL. i. 12-20. Giving thanks unto the FATHER, who . . . hath translated us into the kingdom of his own dear *Son*; . . . who is the image of the invisible God, **THE FIRST-BORN of every creature**: [*πάσης κτίσεως, of all creation* :] for by [*ἐν, in*] him were created all things that are in heaven, and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created through him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by [*ἐν, in*] him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, **THE FIRST-BORN from the dead**; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased him [*i.e. the Father*, as appears from ver. 12] that in him should all fulness dwell.

In this lofty description Paul gives frequent intimations of the inferiority of Christ to the Father. He calls him "*the Son*,"—"the dear Son of the Father;"—a phrase which excludes the ideas of identity and equality. He calls him, not "*the invisible God*," but "*the image of the invisible God*,"—the *representation* of the invisible Deity. He calls him, not the author of all creation, but "**THE FIRST-BORN of all creation**;" and thereby expressly affirms that he was himself created. He does not affirm that he exercised any creative power of his own, independent of the Father's

will ; but that the creation which he effected was accomplished "*through him,*" *as a subordinate agent,*—such being the proper signification of the original phrase, (  $\delta\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ , not  $\epsilon\pi'\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  ). He not only declares him to be "*THE FIRST-BORN of all creation,*" and, as such, brought into existence by the power of the Father, but also that he owed to the same Almighty Being the distinction of being "*the beginning,*" and "*FIRST-BORN from the dead;*" "*for it pleased him,*" says the Apostle, (referring, beyond all question, to *the Father*, as the connection of the passage shows) that in him *should all fulness dwell.*" In this passage, therefore, the Apostle applies, as I have already stated, high and lofty titles to our blessed Lord and Saviour, though not more high and lofty than every Unitarian is most willing to bestow upon him ; but with these distinguished appellations, he gives, at the same time, the clearest intimations, that in his highest state, office, or capacity, he is inferior to the Father, derives his extensive powers and endowments from the Father, and acts as his minister and agent. Now this is downright Unitarianism.

---

Mr BAGOT.—I never felt more forcibly how much I stand in need of the prayers of every Christian in this assembly ; for unless I am guided by a power from above, the malignity of the flesh, which wars against the Spirit, would be likely, from the circumstances in which I am placed, to raise my feelings into a state of indignation, unsuited to Christian principle and temper. Most sincerely do I wish that I could extend to Mr Porter the right hand of Christian fellowship, and join with him in expressing our mutual experience by repeating those words which he has just referred to, in COL. i. 12 to 14 : "*We give thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light ; who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into*

the kingdom of his dear Son ; *in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.*"

I have called on Mr Porter two or three times during this discussion to state what are the precise and definite sentiments which he entertains in reference to the personal rank and dignity of the Saviour. This question he has never answered. I have at length, however, ascertained the reason. It is simply this—*because he has no definite or positive views whatever upon the subject.* Yesterday, for instance, he told you that he believed in the pre-existence of Christ ; but to-day he has said that this doctrine, though he believes in it, is encompassed with some difficulties. Again, he has referred to HEB. i. 9, and has asked me this question, If Christ be God, how can he be said to have "fellows" ? But he has forgotten, that if he believes Christ to be a super-angelic being, standing alone without a compeer in creation, it devolves as much *upon him* to show what is meant when the Apostle speaks of Christ having "fellows ;" and if he acknowledges that he has a fellow, and yet refuses, at the same time, to admit the doctrine of two natures, he must then believe that Christ was either an angel or a man, or an angelic nature united to a human body ; although, indeed, in this last case, it would still be difficult to show who were his "fellows."

I shall now endeavour to illustrate, by a simple application, a principle of reasoning which Mr Porter has employed in his last speech, in order to show you its proper tendency. He produced one part of Scripture in which Christ is called "God," and another in which he is called a minister ; and inferred, from a comparison of the two, that he is not "God" because he is called "a minister !" He might just as well have argued, that because he is styled a "Mediator" in one passage, he cannot be "the Son of God," which he is styled in another !—or that because he is called a "Prophet" in one passage, he cannot be a "Mediator,"



which he is called in another!—or that because he is called a “Man” in one passage, he cannot be the “Lord of glory,” which he is called in another! In fact, by this mode of reasoning, he might prove that Christ is neither Man, nor Mediator, nor Servant, nor Son of God, nor Prophet, nor Minister, as well as that he is not God; so that, if we work out this principle of interpretation to its legitimate issue, we shall prove that there is no such being as Christ revealed in Scripture at all!—for by this algebraic process of explanation, all the passages which speak of Christ’s personal character may be represented as mutually neutralising and destroying each other! But I, on the other hand, am satisfied to take the Bible as it is; and I give equal credit to all the declarations which I find in it in reference to Christ. I believe him to be a “Minister” and a “Mediator.” I assent to both declarations.

I would here remark, that I have in no instance spoken of Christ’s mediatorial *inferiority*, but of his mediatorial *subordination*. This distinction should be well observed.

If the terms, “Son of God,” and “only-begotten Son of God,” be supposed to refer to the humanity of Christ, and not to his divinity, then I admit that, in these respects, he is inferior to the Father. But I wish to make a remark upon the name “only-begotten Son;” and I shall do so, by asking Mr Porter, does he not believe Christ to be a created being? If so, why are there not millions of Christs in existence? for the same power of Deity which could create one, could create a million. It argues against the physical omnipotence of Deity to say, that he could not have created a million of Christs, if Christ be a created being.

Mr Porter alluded to the use of the terms, “Father” and “Son;” and argued that they necessarily imply superiority of nature, and priority of existence, in the one over the other. To this I answer, that so far from these terms implying superiority of nature, a Father

and Son are always of the *same* nature!—and as to their implying priority of existence in one over the other, this may be in one sense the case amongst men; but the analogy cannot be applied to the divine nature. The cause *generally* precedes the effect; but we should draw a distinction between a *necessary* and an *accidental* connection between *cause* and *effect*. When the effect is only the accidental result of the cause, as in the case of a man becoming a father, the cause may be, and always is, antecedent in existence to the effect; but when the effect is the necessary result of the cause, they are both coeval. Thus, when the sun received that power of illumination which is the cause of light, the diffusion of light *instantly* followed, and the *effect* was contemporaneous in existence with the production of the *cause*. If, therefore, we believe that the relationship between God the Father and the Son is of a *necessary* kind, we must believe that the Father and Son are coeval and coeternal; and, even amongst men, a father, *as a father*, does not exist before his son—for no man is a father until he has a son.

Let me now apply these principles to the doctrines which Mr Porter professes to believe. Look to the printed statement of his first proposition, in which he says, “There is one God, *the Father*, who is God alone; to the entire exclusion of the alleged proper Deity of the Word.” I ask him, does he believe in the eternity of “the One God, the Father?” Does he believe that the Father existed from everlasting? He must answer, of course, that he does. But does not a *relative* term necessarily imply the existence of its *correlative*?—consequently, the relative term, “Father,” must include and wrap up in its very existence the coexistence of its correlative, “the Son.” Therefore the Son is coeternal with the Father; and Mr Porter, by admitting the eternity of the latter, necessarily admits the eternity of the former. If not, I ask him, Who

was God before "the Father" existed? I refer, in this argument, to a simple logical principle, that the relative and the correlative are coexistent. And Mr Porter must rub the word "Father" out of the statement of his first proposition before he can answer the argument.

I shall now revert to some of the arguments advanced by Mr Porter yesterday; and shall reply, in the first place, to his remark on JOHN i. 1, "In the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD WAS GOD." Yesterday he told you that *Λογος* (translated "word") is intended to designate the wisdom of God; but to-day, when he wished to argue against his eternity, he assumed that *Λογος* is a title of Christ. Now, whenever Mr Porter advances a principle of interpretation, I like to take, as it were, a loan of it for a few moments, and return it to him again as soon as I have done with it! Yesterday, then, he told you that *Λογος* meant the "wisdom of God." If so, of course the expression, "in the beginning," must be understood to denote "from all eternity;" as there never could have been a time when God was without wisdom. And I would also remarks, that, even allowing that this word is intended to express the "wisdom of God," yet such an interpretation removes the difficulty only one step; as Christ is said, in 1 Cor. i. 24, to be "the wisdom of God."

But I maintain that *Λογος* cannot signify the wisdom of God in this passage; and I do so for the following reasons:—

1. *Σοφία* is the direct Greek term for "wisdom;" not *Λογος*.

2. Even supposing that *Λογος* could denote "wisdom," then the entire passage would be more correctly expressed thus: *Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν ἡ Σοφία, καὶ ἡ Σοφία ἦν ἐν Θεῷ, καὶ ἡ Σοφία ἦν Θεὸς.*

3. Capacities of active power and intelligence, inconsistent with the nature of an attribute, are ascribed to the *Λογος* in ver. 3, 11, 14.

4. It is said, in ver. 4, "In him was life;" but I ask, Is there life in an attribute? Is not life itself an attribute of a person? and is not, therefore, the *Λογος* a person?

5. It is not usual for the New Testament writers to describe the attributes of God by a personification, or to *begin* a serious and solemn *narrative* with the use of figures of speech.

6. No reason can be assigned for the omission of other attributes, such as mercy, which were also involved in the incarnation of Christ.

7. To assert that an attribute of Deity was "with Deity," would be an absurd truism; for where else could the attributes of God be supposed to be? and to say that one attribute of Deity was (without reference to other attributes) Deity itself, would be representing the divine nature as a kind of *imperium in imperio*!—a Deity in Deity!—a part equal to the whole!

8. The *Λογος* is called, in ver. 14, "the only begotten of the Father." Now, admitting that an attribute might, in some figurative sense, be said to have been "begotten;" yet I cannot understand how it could be described as "the *only* begotten," unless God had only one attribute. If this were true, what becomes of the other attributes of Deity? What, for instance, becomes of his mercy, his abstract mercy, upon which Mr Porter rests his hope of salvation, independently of the atonement; forgetting that *mercy* cannot be displayed at the expense of *justice*, nor can it be elevated above the justice of God? For does he not know that the algebraic principle of neutralising one quantity by another cannot be applied to the attributes of the Eternal, so as to represent one attribute as annihilating another? Does he not know, that nothing but the atonement of Christ,—the only work of superero-

gation which could have been performed on behalf of sinners, and which receives an infinite value from the Deity of him who offered it—is the only solid basis upon which he can rest his belief of pardon, and his hopes of everlasting glory?

For these reasons I maintain that *Λογος*, “the Word,” cannot be understood, in JOHN i. 1, as designating “the wisdom of God.” On the other hand, I maintain that this word is a title of Christ, for the following reasons:—

1. It is evident, from verse 14, that it is the designation of a person who “became flesh, and dwelt among us.”

2. Because Christ is described, in REV. xix. 13, under this title, “He was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called the Word of God.” [Mr Porter yesterday asserted that JOHN i. 1 is the only instance which can be produced of the application of the title, *Λογος*, to the Saviour. Now, here is REV. xix. 13, which affords an additional instance; and if that will not satisfy him, I refer him to Heb. iv. 12, 13, “The WORD OF GOD is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart; neither is there any creature that is not manifest in *his* sight; but all things are naked and opened unto *the eyes of him with whom* we have to do.” Here it is evident, from the latter verse, that the Apostle is speaking of a person; and I understand the former verse as a strong figurative description of the scrutinising and searching omniscience of Christ, by which he explores the inmost arcana of the human heart with the same facility as that with which a sword penetrates and divides the flesh.]

The next criticism which Mr Porter advanced, in

connection with John i. 1, was this, That I might as well prove the doctrine of transubstantiation from the words of Christ, "This is my body," as prove the Deity of Christ from the declaration, "The Word was God." Now, I beg to remark here, that, in advocating the doctrine of the Deity of Christ, I have a common interest with my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen ; and I shall not take advantage of this illustration to speak against them upon the present occasion. At a proper time, and in a suitable place, I am always ready to preach against what I consider to be the errors of the Church of Rome ; and I trust I shall never shrink back from being, in this sense, even considered their enemy, if they can call me their enemy because I tell them the truth. I shall, therefore, suggest to Mr Porter another illustration, which will answer his purpose quite as well ; and I will suppose him to have said to me, You might as well prove that our bodies are made of grass, because the Apostle says, "All flesh is grass," as prove the Deity of Christ from the declaration, "The Word was God !" This illustration is just as wise and sensible as the other. But, suppose I retort the principle of reasoning which it involves, how will it then serve his cause ? Suppose, for instance, Mr Porter should advance a text to this effect, "The Father is God," as an argument for the proper Deity of the Father, what would he say to me if I should reject his reasoning by saying to him, You might as well prove that our bodies are made of grass, because the Apostle says, "All flesh is grass," as prove the Deity of the Father from the declaration, "The Father is God !" So that this principle which he has advanced tends to overturn the true Deity of the Father : it places in my hands a powerful and irresistible lever, with which I can upturn and overthrow the very doctrines which Mr Porter himself maintains !

Mr Porter asserted yesterday and to-day that the word Θεός, "God," in the sentence, "The Word was

God," is used in a *subordinate* sense. Let me suppose it is ; and as I am fond of retorting his principles of reasoning against himself, I naturally ask, Why should the same word occur twice in the very same verse, and have a proper meaning in one clause ("The Word was with *God*," ) and a *subordinate* meaning in the latter clause ("The Word was God"). I argue, that if the word "God," in the last clause, has a subordinate meaning, the same word, in the second clause, must also have a subordinate meaning ; and therefore the Father, with whom the Word was, is only God in a subordinate sense ! On the other hand, I maintain, that because the word Θεον, "God," in the second clause, is used in its *proper* sense ; consequently, the same word, Θεος, "God," in the third clause, is also used in a *proper* sense.

But Mr Porter has advanced this criticism, that because Θεος, in this sentence, και Θεός ἦν ὁ Λόγος, "and the Word was God," has no article prefixed to it, it must, therefore, be understood in a *subordinate* sense, and cannot denote *true* Deity. But does not Mr Porter know the reason why there is no article before Θεός ? It is this, because Θεός is the predicate of the proposition in which it occurs ; and also, if it had the article before it, it would be too much identified (grammatically speaking) with Θεόν in the preceding clause, which has the article before *it*, and the phraseology would not keep up the distinction of persons between the Father and the Son : so that, in fact, if the two words were *so* identified by the prefixing of the article before both, THIS PASSAGE OF SCRIPTURE WOULD SEEM TO GIVE COUN- TENANCE TO SABELLIANISM. Further : Does Mr Porter mean to say, that Θεος without the article, does not denote true Deity—and that, on the other hand, when used with the article, it does denote true Deity ? Let me, then, try this principle of criticism by the test of Scripture. Θεος occurs in verse 6 *without* the article, "There was a man sent from God," are we to under-



stand the word "God" in a subordinate sense there? Again, it occurs in verse 13 without the article, "which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Are we to understand the word "God" in a subordinate sense there? Again, it occurs in verse 18 without the article, "No man hath seen God at any time." Are we, also, to understand the word "God" in a subordinate sense there? ON THE OTHER HAND, if you look to 2 Cor. iv. 4, you will find Θεός *with* the article applied to the Devil, who is there styled "the God of this world;" so that this criticism of Mr Porter's is worth absolutely nothing!

Now, as I am very fond of borrowing Mr Porter's *principles* of interpretation, and making use of them for a time, and when—to use a vulgar expression—I have taken a turn out of them, give them back to him again; I shall now make some use of this principle of reasoning which he laid down, when he stated that the predicate of a proposition may always have the article before it; and I shall apply it to the interpretation of a passage upon which Mr Porter no doubt lays great stress, and which you will find in 1 Cor. xv. 24 to 28, "*Then* cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. (For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him.) And when all things shall be subdued unto him, *then* shall the Son also himself be subject to him that did put all things under him, that God may be all in all." The last verse reads thus in the original, ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, ἵνα ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. But before I apply Mr Porter's

criticism to this text, I must first give a general explanation of the entire passage. The kingdom which is mentioned in it cannot be understood to refer to the general dominion of the universe which Christ sustains *as God*; for that kingdom shall continue for ever, as we learn from ISA. ix. 7, "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be *no end*, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth *even for ever*;" and from LUKE i. 33: "He shall reign over the house of Jacob *for ever*; and of his kingdom there shall be *no end*;"—and from HEB. i. 8, "Thy throne, O God, is *for ever and ever*;"—and also from HEB. xii. 8, where it is described as a "kingdom which cannot be moved."

The kingdom, therefore, which is referred to in the passage under consideration, must be understood to refer to the *mediatorial* kingdom of Christ, which he undertook in subordination to the Father's *will*, which he carries on in subordination to the Father's *will*, and which he will surrender in subordination to the Father's *will*. And here I would remark, that the fact of a person acting in subordination to the *will* of another, for a limited time and for a specific object, cannot prove an *inferiority of nature* in the person so acting; but only proves a *temporary official* compliance with the other's *will*.

Now this passage of Scripture merely asserts that, when the objects for which Christ's mediatorial kingdom was instituted shall have been attained, it shall be surrendered to the Father; *and that, in the act of surrendering his kingdom to the Father, Christ will be acting in full compliance with the Father's will*. Now, I request you to attend to this last remark, because it is too generally assumed on one side, and admitted on the other, that the clause "*then shall the Son also himself be subject*," &c., *refers* to that eternity which will succeed the act of Christ's surrendering his kingdom.

But the word τότε (then) never can be used in the sense of a *continuing period*, much less as denoting a period which will never end. This word invariably refers to a *specific date*; and in this passage refers to the particular *date* of Christ's surrendering his kingdom to the Father. It is evident, therefore, that this passage may be thus paraphrased, "When all things shall be subdued to the Son as Mediator, then, as the mediatorial kingdom will be no longer necessary, he will surrender that kingdom to the Father, who sustains the higher office in the economy of grace, in order that (not 'God the Father,' as in verse 24, but in order that) God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, may be all in all: so that as the Mediator was all in all during the continuance of his kingdom (COL. iii. 11), so, after its termination, the Divine Being will be all in all, and carry on the government of the universe by a *direct* and *immediate* administration. And, in surrendering his kingdom, Christ will be acting in full compliance with the will of the Father, whose good pleasure it is that he should surrender an official state, which *necessarily* implies subordination, and should cease to be subordinate. Or, in fact, *he will be acting in subjection to the Father's will, in ceasing to be subject.*"

I shall now apply Mr Porter's principle of interpretation to this passage. The principle to which I allude is this: That the predicate of a proposition may always have the article before it. Upon this principle, I see nothing to prevent me from translating the 28th verse thus, "*When* all things shall be subdued unto him, then (*i.e.* in surrendering his kingdom) shall the Son be subject to him that did put all things under him, that *he* (*i.e.* the Son) may be God all in all." Mr Porter's principle that the predicate may have the article, removes every objection to my regarding ὁ Θεός, "God," as the predicate of the proposition; and it is a very general rule of Greek Syntax that, where the adverb *ἵνα* is *immediately* followed by a verb, we are to look back to

the *preceding* sentence for the nominative case to the verb which follows *ἵνα*.

[But whilst I am engaged with this passage of Scripture, I would wish to direct your attention to the distinction which the Apostle makes in verse 24, between ἐξουσίαν, “authority,” and δύναμιν, “ability.” He evidently refers to these as two distinct things. The remark I wish to make is this: That, though Christ says in MATT. xxviii. 18, ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία, “all *authority* has been given to me,” he never said, ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα δύναμις, “all *ability* has been given to me.” Christ, as *Mediator*, received ἐξουσίαν, “authority;” but he did not receive δύναμιν, “ability:” and his reception of the “authority” necessarily implies his previous possession of the “ability;” for it would have been absurd to have given “authority” to one who did not possess the “ability” required for its effectual exercise.]

And I would also call upon Mr Porter to account for the phraseology in the 24th verse, “God the Father.” If the Father exclusively be God, why use the words, “God the Father”? Would not the word “God” have been sufficient? and do not these words imply the existence of another person beside “God the Father,” who is God?

Mr Porter has asked me, in reference to JOHN i. 1, “How could Christ be the same God with whom he was?” I answer, that he could have been the same *God* with the Father, though not the same *person* with the Father. And I would refer him to two passages of Scripture, which prove that the clause, “the Word was with God,” means, that the Word was *with the Father*;—to JOHN xvii. 5, “And now, O *Father*, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had *with thee* before the world was;”—and to 1 JOHN i. 2, “For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life *which was with the Father*.”

Mr Porter next adverted to JOHN i. 3, “All things

were made by him," (πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;) and asserted that Christ was a *created* and finite instrument in the hands of the Creator, and was employed by him in creating all things. And how did he prove this? By a very "wire-drawn" criticism upon the Greek preposition *δια*. [And here I may remark, that I am not in the habit of suspending my creed on fine-spun criticisms upon Greek prepositions.] But let me examine this criticism. He asserted that *δια* always denotes the *instrumental cause*. Now, if this criticism be true, I should wish to know how he will explain ROM. xi. 36, "For of him (*i.e.* God), and through him (*δι' αὐτοῦ*), and to him, are all things." Are we to understand from this passage, that God was only the *instrumental* cause of all things? or how will he explain HEB. ii. 10, "For it became him (*i.e.* the Father), for whom (*δι' ὃν*) are all things, and by whom (*δι' οὗ*) are all things"? Are we to understand from this passage that "the Father" was only the *instrumental* cause of all things? Thus his argument that *δια*, in JOHN i. 3, only denotes that Christ was the *instrumental* cause of the creation, falls to the ground. And I may remark that the passage in HEB. ii. 10, to which I have just referred, contains both *δι' ὃν*, "for whom," and *δι' οὗ*, "by whom," and illustrates this rule of Greek syntax: That when *δια* denotes the *final cause*, it governs the *accusative*; and when it denotes the *efficient cause*, it governs the *genitive* case. I argue, therefore, that *δια* denotes the efficient cause; and even supposing it did denote the *instrument*, still I can prove, by a reference to HOSEA i. 7, that the *instrument* is no less a person than Jehovah himself: "I will have mercy on the house of Judah, and will save them *by Jehovah* their God."

I shall close this address by alluding to an argument which Mr Porter advanced yesterday against my reasoning for the Deity of Christ, by comparing texts in which the same divine attributes are referred to Christ and Jehovah or God. He quoted ISA. vii. 4, in which

the prophet is represented *as speaking to Ahaz*, and compared it with the 10th verse, in which Jehovah is represented *as speaking to Ahaz*; and he told you that, upon my principles of reasoning, I ought to argue for the Deity of ISAIAH! I ask him, in reply, Is “speaking” a divine work? Cannot *all creatures* who are endowed with this faculty, *speak*? And I beg to remind him that, when I argue for the Deity of Christ from a comparison of texts in which “Jehovah” or “God” is spoken of with others in which “Christ” is spoken of, I confine myself exclusively to those in which the same *divine* works or prerogatives are attributed in each, and do not refer to texts in which actions are spoken of which might be performed by creatures. Thus when I find it asserted in Ps. lxxviii. 56, that the Israelites “tempted and provoked the Most High God;” and when, again, in 1 Cor. x. 9, I find this very transaction referred to Christ in these words, “Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted,”—I naturally identify “Christ” in the latter passage with “the Most High God” in the former: just as—when I find an assertion made in Acts vii. 58, that a person named “Saul” was standing by at the martyrdom of Stephen, and took charge of the clothes of the witnesses; and again, in Acts xxii. 20, I find a person named “Paul” declaring that, “when the blood of the martyr Stephen was shed, he was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him,”—I infer, from a comparison of these two passages, that “Saul” and “Paul” are common designations of the same person. So, likewise, when I find the same divine works and prerogatives, or the same identical facts, referred to “God” in one passage, and to Christ in another, I infer that Christ is God—one God with the Father, *not* one person with the Father.

---

MR PORTER.—Mr Bagot having, in the speech which you have just heard, publicly explained how, in consistency with his theory, the term "*Father*" is so often used in reference to the Supreme Being, and how and why it is that in Scripture the phrase "*GOD THE FATHER*," occurs so frequently,—I beg to ask him to explain, on the same principle, how it is that the phrase, "*GOD THE SON*," never occurs?

This is a plain question, and *I expect a direct answer.*

MR BAGOT.—I have proved by innumerable passages, advanced both yesterday and to-day, that Christ is God. It is said, for instance, in JOHN i. 1, "The Word was God;" in ROM. ix. 5, that Christ is "God over all, blessed for ever;" and 1 JOHN v. 20, that the Son of God is "true God and eternal life." There is God the Son.

MR PORTER.—It is but seldom that I have had occasion to congratulate myself on the exercise of caution and circumspection; but, on the contrary, I have frequently been obliged to regret my not having taken sufficient pains to guard myself against a contingent evil. For once in my life, however, I have been prudent. I am happy, exceedingly happy, that the speech which I delivered at the close of yesterday's proceedings was accurately prepared and written down previously, with the exception of a few *extempore* remarks, in reply to Mr Bagot's speech just before pronounced. I am exceedingly happy that this was the case, because, from the manner in which Mr Bagot has treated my statements, attributing to me sentiments which I never entertained, and language which I never uttered, I have reason to fear that, unless I could thus positively identify every syllable of what I advanced, I should be in the hands of one whose tender mercies to my arguments would be cruel. It is not, of course, of his attempts to answer my statements that I complain. Could he do so convincingly, it would please me well. Truly gratified should I be, when thus convinced, to



be able to embrace the *popular tenets* conscientiously, and perhaps to become a member of that dominant hierarchy, with which there is connected so much of worldly honour, emolument, and respect; and in which I see individuals, not infinitely my superiors in personal merit, advanced to elevated stations. Nothing would give me greater pleasure, therefore, than to hear Mr Bagot refute my arguments, and demonstrate that my doctrines are wrong. It is not, then, of his attempts to *answer* my arguments that I complain: I complain that in his statement of them he has mangled them and murdered them. If he means to refute my positions, he ought surely to state them correctly. To mis-state and distort them, and then to ground an argument on his own misrepresentations, is not answering *my* arguments at all, but answering some supposed assertions which I never made, and for which I am not accountable: they are not mine, any more than they are his own.

These remarks have been drawn from me by Mr Bagot's language with respect to my observations on JOHN i. 1. In order that you may see *how very closely* Mr Bagot kept to the point of my criticism, and *how intimately* connected with the subject is all that he advanced respecting the explanation of the *Λόγος* as the wisdom of the Deity, and concerning the personification of an attribute; and indeed to prove *how directly* the whole of his argument on that text bore on the subject of discussion,—I shall simply read to you, from the paper now before me, what I actually did say on the occasion alluded to by my reverend opponent:—

“Another passage on which Mr Bagot laid much stress, on this, as on former occasions, is JOHN i. 1, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. . .* On this passage of Scripture, however, now before us, it is worthy of remark, that several learned men have been of opinion that by the

Word we are not here to understand the *person* of Christ, but the *wisdom* of God which dwelt in him.

“*But leaving this observation out of view altogether, and allowing the common translation to stand unaltered, the phrase ‘the word was God’ no more proves his Supreme Deity, than the language ‘this is my body, this is my blood,’ proves the doctrine of Transubstantiation,*” &c. &c. &c.

And then I went on to explain the passage on a totally different principle from that on which Mr Bagot has commented. He will follow me in this debate; and as he has not yet answered my reasoning on JOHN i. 1, I hope he will do so much justice to his cause, to his opponent, and to this auditory, as to do so now; and that, in future, he will endeavour to be more accurate in his statement of my arguments. I appeal to you, if I have dealt with his observations as he has dealt with mine. I appeal to himself, if he has once had reason, since the commencement of this discussion, to complain of me for having mis-stated a syllable of what he advanced. These repeated inaccuracies on his part (I should be loth to say, and I do not say, *wilful* inaccuracies) certainly prove that he has not been paying that continued attention to my statements which I felt myself bound, and which I endeavoured to pay to his.

Some of the statements which Mr Bagot has laid before you might be made the subjects of most ludicrous animadversion, were the subject of this controversy not of a nature too awful to be contemplated in a ridiculous point of view. He has told you that “the cause *generally* precedes the effect!” I ought, I suppose, to thank him for so large and so generous an admission! Mr Bagot, then, admits that, *generally speaking*, the cause precedes the effect! and with this *important concession* I should have been well satisfied, had he not subsequently neutralised its effect by declaring that *in all cases* the father is “*coeval*” with his own son; that is to say, *the son is in all cases as old as his own father!* This was said, not with regard

to *Deity* alone, but with express reference to *human beings* and to *human nature*. The father and the son "*coeval!!*" The son as old as his own father!!! What weight can be attached to an argument such as this? I feel that I do his position more than justice in calling it an argument; but such is the reasoning he has brought forward to prove the coeternity of Christ, the Son of God, with God the Father. It is not an argument; it is a mere quibbling sophism upon an awful subject. I hope Mr Bagot is sensible of the importance of the question in debate between us; but I am sorry to say, that in a great many instances, whether through inattention or design, he has given us a number of examples which would induce a contrary impression.

Mr Bagot went on further to tell us, that because the Israelites are supposed to be represented as having tempted Christ, in a certain passage of Scripture, Christ must be God over all; since, as he has stated, "*none but God can be the object of sin;*" or, in other words, sin can be committed against no being but God. As a short answer to this argument, I would merely refer him to another passage in the New Testament, in which the Apostle Paul declares to the church of the Corinthians, that "he who committeth" a certain offence, which he specifies, "*sinneth against his own body!*" Did the Apostle then mean to represent a *man's body* as possessed of a proper Deity? Is a man's *own body* his God? After this simple reference, I leave Mr Bagot's argument to speak for itself.

Mr Bagot referred to my observation on the preposition *διὰ*, which is uniformly employed in the New Testament where the creation is said to have been accomplished *through* or *by* Christ; and affirmed that the same preposition is frequently used in Scripture with reference to the Supreme Being; and, of course, in circumstances where it cannot denote the instrumental case. Now I neither have time, nor should I ex-

actly wish, to undertake the trouble at present to go over all the texts in the New Testament in which *διὰ* is found followed by a genitive case. I shall therefore content myself with reading the following short extract from the writings of a gentleman, in whose veracity and candour I, in common with all who know him, repose the fullest reliance,—I mean the Rev JAMES YATES, now minister of CARTER-LANE CHAPEL, in the city of London, and author of a most satisfactory reply to Dr WARDLAW'S Discourses; a work which Mr Bagot yesterday stated had *never been answered*. In the course of this reply, at page 84, Mr YATES states:—

“The preposition *διὰ*, followed by a genitive or accusative case, occurs in the New Testament about six hundred and thirty times. It is used to denote *the efficient cause of the production of an effect* (of course governing in these instances the genitive) about two hundred and ninety times. I have examined all the passages where it is found. I have observed that its general application, when used to point out an efficient cause, is to represent not the *primary*, but the *secondary*, or *instrumental* cause.”

And in a note on this passage, Mr YATES adds,—

“Against the *universality* of this rule, only one passage presents much difficulty: 1 Cor. i. 9, *διὸ οὐ ἐκλήθητε*, “*through whom ye were called*.” But even here there is strong reason for considering *ὑπο* as the true reading.—See Griesbach. Even allowing *διὰ* to denote the original cause in two or three passages, still the probability that it denoted the *instrumental*, would be, in any doubtful case, as a hundred to one.”

I would gladly lay before you the extracts which Mr YATES has adduced from the Greek Fathers, ORIGEN and EUSEBIUS—those eminently learned and honest writers—entirely confirming the view of the meaning of this preposition which has been now stated, but that I must go on to lay before you as much as I can of the positive evidence in support of my two propositions, which remains yet to be considered. I have scarcely time sufficient to bring it forward consistently with that intelligibility which I am anxious to preserve,

and I fear I shall be obliged to omit a considerable number of very important references.

1. In continuation of the proof that Christ is expressly declared in Scripture to be *a created being*, I appeal to his own words in—

REV. iii. 14. These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, *the beginning of the creation of God.*

2. There are several texts which affirm that Christ derived his *Existence* from the Father ; as, for example—

JOHN v. 26. For as the Father hath life in himself, so *hath he given to the Son* to have life in himself.

And this passage, which contains our Lord's own words, affords a sufficient answer to the argument for our Lord's self-existence, which Mr Bagot built on the words of the Evangelist, "In him was life ;" for it shows that the life which was in the Son was *the gift of the Father*—not an inherent or independent existence. To this I may add another declaration of his own :—

JOHN vi. 57. The living Father hath sent me ; *and I live by the Father.*

As, therefore, the former passage proves that he had *received* existence from the Father at the first ; so does the latter expressly affirm that he *continued* to live "*by the Father,*" and that his life depended on the Father's will.

3. The following texts prove by express and explicit declaration that the *knowledge* which Christ possessed was derived from the Father :—

JOHN v. 30. *As I hear, I judge :* and my judgment is just ; because *I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father* who hath sent me.

JOHN v. 20. The Father loveth the Son, *and showeth him all things* that he himself doeth.

JOHN vii. 16, 17. *My doctrine is not mine*, but HIS THAT SENT ME. If any man will do his will, he will know of the doctrine whether it be *of God*, or whether I speak *of myself*.

From the manner in which our Saviour contrasts the two sources whence his knowledge could be supposed to come—(from *God*, and from *himself*)—it is evident that had it come from *himself* it would *not* have been *of God*; consequently, he denies his deity in this passage, besides affirming, what indeed amounts to the same thing, that his doctrine was communicated to him by the Father. The same fact is stated in—

JOHN viii. 26. He that sent me is true; and *I speak* to the world *those things which I have heard* OF HIM.

JOHN viii. 28. *As my Father hath taught me*, I speak these things.

Strange that, if he were the Supreme Being, he should require the teaching of the Father to instruct him in the truth!

JOHN xii. 49-50. *I have not spoken of myself*; but THE FATHER who sent me, HE GAVE ME COMMANDMENT, *what I should say*, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting; *whatsoever I speak, therefore*, EVEN AS THE FATHER HATH SAID UNTO ME, *so I speak*.

Now, I ask, can words more expressly, more pointedly, convey the idea of derived knowledge, than these of our blessed Lord?—and if these are inadequate disclaimers of divine wisdom, I ask WHAT FORM OF LANGUAGE WOULD BE SUFFICIENT FOR THE PURPOSE? I hope to hear these passages explained by Mr Bagot; and I hope also, that if he interprets these declarations as spoken by our Lord in his *human* nature merely, he will inform us upon what he grounds that distinction of *natures* in the person of Christ which is so necessary for the support of his theory, and what criterion he applies by which it may be known *when* he speaks *in one capacity*, and *when* he speaks *in the other*—seeing that

he himself never refers to such a distinction, *but uniformly speaks of himself as ONE*. You will observe that in all these passages (except one) he designates himself by the personal pronoun *I*,—a word which is always employed to denote the whole and entire person of the speaker in all his capacities, offices, or relations; and that our Lord gives no intimation that he uses it in a peculiar or restricted sense, to point out *one* of his [supposed] two natures only, and *not the other*. According to Mr Bagot, we gather from different passages that Christ was possessed of two natures, a human and a divine. I would wish him, then, to tell us, what neither Christ himself nor any of his disciples has informed us, how we are to know when he speaks of the one and when of the other.

JOHN xv. 15. *All things that I have heard from my Father, I have made known to you.*

JOHN xvii. 7, 8. Now they have known that *all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee.*

These are plain, express, unequivocal proofs of my position, proceeding from the lips of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and therefore coming to us with the highest authority. We cannot account for his employment of such language, while he was possessed of perfect omniscience, and himself the source of all truth and of all knowledge, without at the same time asserting that he wilfully employed language calculated to mislead his hearers and those with whom he conversed. Never has it been affirmed of any *man*, either in Scripture or in any other composition, that his knowledge was *derived*, more distinctly than our Lord in these texts declares that all his knowledge was derived from the Father. Let Mr Bagot bring forward a single text as plainly and as distinctly affirming that the knowledge of Christ was *underived*, as these texts affirm the reverse, and I am satisfied to give up the argument which they afford against his proper deity—but not till then. To the same effect as the foregoing declarations



of our Lord himself, recorded in the Gospels, are several very distinct assertions contained in the other books of Scripture.

HEB. i. 1, 2. *God*, who at sundry times and in divers manners *spake* in time past unto the fathers *by the prophets*, hath in these last days spoken unto us *by his Son*, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by [through] whom also he made the worlds.

The latter clause ought properly to be rendered “made the *ages*,” but this is immaterial to our present purpose, since it is equally apparent, whatever translation be adopted, that the wisdom with which Christ taught, and the power which he exercised, were *both derived* from God, and not his own inherently. To the same effect we read in that book of REVELATION to which Mr Bagot is so remarkably fond of referring :—

REV. i. 1. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*, which GOD GAVE UNTO HIM, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass ; and he sent and signified *by his angel* unto his servant John.

On which I shall only ask how it would be possible for Christ to receive *from God* A REVELATION—that is, a discovery of things previously unknown—if he were, at the very time when he received it, *truly and properly God* himself ?

4. The places wherein it is clearly and pointedly stated that Christ derived from the Father his *Power* are so numerous that I can only bring forward a very meagre selection. The following, however, will render this point perfectly obvious :—

JOHN x. 32. Jesus answered them, *Many good works* have I shown you *from my Father*.

In these words he undeniably refers to his Father as the source of that miraculous energy which he possessed.

JOHN v. 19-20. Then answered Jesus and said unto them,

THE SON CAN DO NOTHING OF HIMSELF, but what *he seeth the Father do*; for whatsoever things he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For *the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth*; and greater works he will show him than these, that ye may marvel.

JOHN v. 30. I CAN OF MINE OWN SELF DO NOTHING.

JOHN viii. 28. Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am [he], and that *I do nothing of myself*.

ACTS x. 38. *God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power.*

This verse I quoted before to establish another point. The last word, however, is so peculiarly applicable to that which I am now engaged in illustrating—viz., that our Lord's *power* was *derived*, not *inherent*—that I feel I need make no apology for again presenting it to your notice. The same remark may be made on—

ACTS ii. 22. Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, *which God did by* [i.e., *through*] *him*.

No language can be more directly in favour of my argument than that of our Lord in—

JOHN xiv. 10. THE FATHER that dwelleth in me, *he doeth the works*.

In further proof of the same position, I now advert to the narrative of a remarkable occasion, on which the miraculous power which our Lord possessed was most conspicuously displayed: I mean the raising of Lazarus from the dead, in which our Saviour most clearly acknowledges a derived power to work miracles:—

JOHN xi. 21-23. Martha said unto Jesus, “Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. But I know that even now, *whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee*.” Jesus saith unto her, “Thy brother shall rise again.” [41-43.] And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, “Father, I thank thee *that thou hast heard me*. And I knew that *thou hearest me always*; but because of the people that stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.” And when he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud voice, “Lazarus, come forth.”

I may take this opportunity of adverting to a remark which Mr Bagot made, founded on the words which occur in this passage, "Because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." From this expression he argued that all the various prayers which Christ presented to God were not offered up in the desire, or with the intention, to procure anything for himself, since he was himself the source and fountain of every blessing; but were simply designed to produce an effect on the people who surrounded him, and who witnessed his [*apparent*] devotion. Now, I pass by what appears to me a very irreverent mode of dealing with the character of Christ; which I think it is, to assert that he did anything, not for the real purpose for which it was professed to be done, but for the purpose of producing *an effect* on the minds of spectators. I recur to another incident in our Saviour's conduct, which will prove that Mr Bagot's hypothesis is very far from the truth. We are informed that, on one occasion, he retired to a mountain to pray *apart*. Did he pray in this manner for the sake of effect on the minds of the bystanders? There were no bystanders; but, according to his own precept, he prayed to his Father, whose eye seeth in secret, and who was the only witness to his devotion. We read elsewhere, that our Saviour spent whole nights in prayer—the prayer of solitude and retirement. But all this was done, as Mr Bagot informs us, because of those who stood by! This explanation will not suffice. It will not do to say that the human nature of Christ was then engaged in prayer to his proper Deity, *for the sake of effect*! Some other explanation of these passages must be sought.

5. I shall now prove to you, by precise and unequivocal declarations of Scripture, that the *Authority* which Christ exercised was derived from the Father. I begin with his own words in—

MATT. xxviii. 18. *All authority [ἐξουσία] is given unto me in heaven and in earth.*

REV. ii. 26, 27. *He that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give authority over the nations : and he shall rule them with a rod of iron : . . . even as I have received of my Father.*

Now, let us suppose that these words, "I will give authority over the nations to rule them with a rod of iron," had been spoken by our Saviour without those other expressions which are found in the context, what an admirable proof of Christ's supreme divinity they would have furnished ! Who could give authority over the nations but God only ? it would have been asked in a triumphant tone. But from the text as it stands, it is evident that *Christ himself had received this authority*, and received it *from the Father* ; which plainly shows that his mediatorial authority, or kingdom, is also derived from the Father.

JOHN iii. 35. *The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands.*

Our Lord does not say that the Father had loved *his human nature*, and given all things into *its* hands ; but that, in his whole and entire nature, the Father loved him, and intrusted him with the authority with which he was invested. I turn back to the prophecy in—

LUKE i. 32, 33. *The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David : and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever ; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.*

JOHN iii. 37-39. *All that the Father giveth me shall come to me ; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out : for I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me ; and this is the Father's will that hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.*

JOHN x. 17, 18. *Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me [see xix. 11.], but I lay it down of myself. I have authority [ἐξουσίαν] to lay it down, and I have authority to take it again. This promise have I received of my Father. [ἐντολή: Promissio divina.—Schleusner.]*

6. I am obliged, by want of time, to omit a great number of texts, which I have marked down in the notes that lie before me ; and all of which have a direct reference to the point which I am now illustrating. Omitting them, as I conceive I may with perfect safety, after the numbers which have been already adduced, I come to those passages in which it is declared, that whatever *Honour and Glory* our Saviour had, were bestowed upon him by the Father, and were enjoyed in subordination to the Father.

PHIL. ii. 11. [He became obedient unto death :] wherefore God also *hath highly exalted him*, and *given* him a name that is above every name ;—that in [ἐν] the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of [things] in heaven, and of [things] in earth, and of [things] under the earth ; and that every tongue should confess that *Jesus Christ is Lord*,—TO THE GLORY OF GOD, THE FATHER !

Had this quotation been found without those words which occur in the latter part and at the beginning of the sentence, what a splendid proof it would have been supposed to afford of the inherent Deity of our Saviour ! and what a copious theme for declamation it would have presented against any person who might have supposed that the phrases which it contains *could be explained* so as not to argue the supremacy of the being to whom they are applied ! He would have been cried down as guilty of tampering with the word of God and with the souls of men, by frittering away the express teaching of Scripture ! Unfortunately, however, for those who might have made this use of the passage, the Apostle himself declares that “ *God* ” *elevated* our Lord to his exalted station, and *bestowed* upon him that majestic name, and *invested* him with that pre-eminence which he enjoys ; so that, even in his greatest state of dignity, this high and lofty Lord is subordinate and inferior to God, the Father ; insomuch that the homage and honour paid him are rendered “ *to the glory of God, the Father !* ”

HEB. ii. 9. We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, *for the suffering of death*, crowned with glory and honour.

Surely, in this passage, the glory and honour of Christ are declared to be derived!

And, lastly, there are numerous assertions in Scripture, which prove that,

IN ALL THINGS, CHRIST WAS AND IS SUBORDINATE AND INFERIOR TO THE FATHER.

MATT. xx. 20-23. Grant [said the mother of the sons of Zebedee to our Saviour] that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left, in thy kingdom. . . . He saith, . . . To sit on my right hand and on my left hand, *is not mine to grant*, EXCEPT TO THOSE FOR WHOM IT IS PREPARED OF MY FATHER.

Christ then declared that stations of pre-eminence in his kingdom he was not authorised to bestow. This was beyond his delegated authority, and belonged to the peculiar prerogative of his Father! I leave it to yourselves to determine, whether this declaration can be reconciled with the doctrine of the proper Deity of Christ by any principle of interpretation which would not make him guilty of equivocation, mental reservation, and not merely virtual, but actual falsehood. Against all such interpretations I will record my protest. While I own myself a follower and disciple of Jesus, I will, in consistency with my faith and my profession, vindicate his veracity from all aspersions!

JOHN xiv. 28. MY FATHER IS GREATER THAN I.

According to the orthodox interpretation, these words must signify, "*My Father is NOT greater than I.*"

1 COR. xi. 3. The head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and *the head of Christ is God*.

1 COR. iii. 22, 23. Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to

come ; all are yours ; *and ye are Christ's* ; AND CHRIST IS God's.

Upon this text I may repeat a supposition that I have already applied to some others. Had we read that the world, and life, and death, and things present, and things to come, *all were Christ's*,—what a convincing argument it would have afforded to believers in his proper Deity ! I am quite certain it would have been put forward prominently among the fancied proofs of his omnipotence. We find, however, that the assertion is made *of Christians in general* ! Christians themselves are indeed declared, in the next clause, to belong to Christ ; but in that which follows, Christ is, in the same terms, and therefore in the same sense, affirmed *to belong to God* ! If this be not a proof of inferiority, I know not what proof would suffice.

I shall only be able to advert to one passage more :

1 COR. xv. 24-28. Then cometh the end, when [Christ] shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father ; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and all power : for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. Death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed : for he hath “put” all things under his feet. But when he saith, “All things are *put* under him,” it is manifest that He is excepted who did “*put*” all things under him. And when all things shall be “put” under him, *then shall the Son also be “put” under him that did “put” all things under him*,—THAT GOD MAY BE ALL IN ALL !

Upon this context Mr Bagot reasoned at length ; but I have not time to examine his statements minutely. It is unnecessary to dwell upon his proposed emendation of the version in the last clause—viz., “*that he [i.e. Christ] may be God, all in all* ;” because, after *proving* this *must be* the meaning of the passage, he admitted that *it is not* ! On this point, therefore, I need not delay. Neither shall I controvert his view of the meaning of the particle *τότε*, as denoting *a particular point*, rather than *a continuous succession of time*. I shall not contest this criticism, because I en-



tirely concur in it. But Mr Bagot, in the remainder of his explanation, overlooked the fact, that the word which in King James's translation is rendered "*shall be subject*," is not an adjective in the original, but a verb in the future tense (*ὑποταγήσεται*), the same which is, in the other verses, translated "*put under*;" and that it ought here to be rendered by the same, or an equivalent phrase. In fact, it means not "*shall be subject*," but "*shall be subjected*;" and to disprove it I challenge the world.

I now leave my arguments in the hands of Mr Bagot, with a parting request, that if he thinks them worth noticing at all, he will state them correctly, and answer them fairly.

---

MR BAGOT.—Mr Porter has just called upon me to state the objections which he considers himself to have advanced against my doctrines explicitly, and to answer them fairly. I beg to say, that this is a strange request. It is rather odd that he should ask me to argue *against myself*. There is not a single passage which Mr Porter has advanced, which is not a *positive* and *affirmative* proof on my side, substantiating and illustrating *my* propositions. Look, for instance, to the printed statement of my second proposition, and you will find that I have undertaken to prove, that the Lord Jesus Christ is *Mediator* and *perfect Man*, as well as perfect God. Now, every passage advanced by Mr Porter in his last speech has proved for me, that Christ *was a man*. Why, then, should I argue against myself, by controverting these arguments? If he has kindly assisted me in building up my temple, why should I demolish the handiwork which he has performed in my behalf? In fact, instead of three speeches to-day, I shall have delivered six—three in my own person, and three in the person of Mr Porter as my representative!

I shall, therefore, refer to the arguments which Mr Porter yesterday advanced, and to which I have not as yet replied.

He referred to NEH. ix. 27, "According to thy manifold mercies, thou gavest them *Saviours*, who saved them out of the hand of their enemies;" and he argued that I might as well maintain the Deity of *all the Saviours* spoken of in this text as believe in the Deity of Christ from the fact of his being called "Saviour"! I answer this by simply stating what my argument for the Deity of Christ, from his being called "Saviour," really is. It is just this: Jehovah is called "Saviour" *in the highest sense of the word*, and Christ is called "Saviour" *in the highest sense of the word*: therefore, as there is only *one* Saviour in the highest sense, Christ is Jehovah. And on referring to 2 PER. iii. 18, you will there find that Christ is styled Saviour in the highest sense of the term: "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; to him be glory both now and for ever. Amen."

He next referred to EXOD. iii. 14, in which Jehovah says, "I am that I am;" and then to 1 COR. xv. 10, in which the Apostle says, "By the grace of God I am what I am:" and he told me that I might as well argue for the Deity of Paul from a comparison of these two passages, as for the Deity of Christ from the comparison of texts which I instituted in the course of my address on Monday! I ask, Am I to occupy your time by replying to such arguments as these? Is it necessary for me to show the difference between the language of Paul, "By the grace of God I am *what* I am," and the ineffable and incommunicable title of Jehovah, "I am *that* I am"?

These two examples will be sufficient to refute any other objection of a similar description which Mr Porter may have advanced. And I would again define the nature of the argument I have based upon a comparison of texts in which "Jehovah" or "God" is spoken of,

with others in which Christ is spoken of, by reminding you that I have selected only those texts in which characteristics or prerogatives *peculiar to Deity* are referred to "Jehovah" in one passage, and to "Christ" in the corresponding passage. Mr Porter himself has sanctioned this principle of reasoning, as I yesterday told you, by adopting it as a mode of proving the Deity of the Father ; for he produced six or seven texts from the Gospel of JOHN, in which "God" is spoken of, and compared them with corresponding passages, in which the "Father" is spoken of under the very same circumstances, and thence inferred that the Father is God ; and, consequently, by his use of this principle of reasoning, he has given to it the impress of his sanction and approval.

The argument which I deduced from the words of Christ in MATT. xxviii. 18, "All power (*ἐξουσία*) is given unto me in heaven and in earth," has been again and again objected against by Mr Porter : I therefore beg to illustrate it. It is an obvious principle, that no vessel can hold more than what it is able to contain ! A pint measure cannot contain a quart !—therefore, the receiver must always have a capacity of retention commensurate with the dimensions of the thing received. As *all* power, then, in heaven and in earth is given to the Saviour, he must have a capacity commensurate with the possession of "*all* power in heaven and in earth." Let Mr Porter answer what that capacity is. And I would again remark the difference which there is between *ἐξουσία*, "authority," which occurs in this text, and *δυναμὶς*, "ability." The doctrine I have laid down in reference to these words is this : That Christ, as Mediator, received the "authority" (*ἐξουσία*) from the Father ; whilst, as God, he possessed in himself the "ability" (*δυναμὶς*) by which he was enabled to exercise the authority. Let Mr Porter produce a passage in which it is said, that Christ, "in his highest capacity, nature, or condition," received "ability" from a

being infinitely superior to himself, and the question is settled !

He next produced the declaration of Paul, in PHIL. iv. 13, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me ;" and he argued that I might as well believe in the omnipotence of the Apostle Paul, in consequence of this declaration, as in the omnipotence of Christ, in consequence of those passages in which he is represented as being able to do all things. But I remark, in reply to this objection, that the word "all" is used in Scripture with a varying latitude of signification ; as it sometimes denotes *all things absolutely*, and sometimes only *all things of a particular class specified in the context*. If, then, we examine this passage with even ordinary attention, we shall find that the latter principle applies to it, and that the Apostle simply means to say that he "*can do all things which Christ's strengthening enabled him to do.*" So that this text presents to our minds a glorious and animating declaration of the confidence which Paul reposed in THE OMNIPOTENCE OF CHRIST.

He also referred to 1 JOHN ii. 20, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things ;" and argued that this declaration would prove the omniscience of all Christians as effectually as JOHN xxi. 17, "Lord, thou knowest all things," can prove the omniscience of Christ. But here also I remark that the expression "all things," refers to a particular class defined in the passage itself. In fact, this text may be thus paraphrased, "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things *of which that unction communicates the knowledge.*" On the other hand, the declaration in JOHN xxi. 17, "Lord, thou knowest all things ; thou knowest that I love thee," is, as I said before, a regular syllogism ; and unless we understand the word "all" in its full and unrestricted sense, the inference drawn in the passage would be illogical and inconclusive.

He next referred to the words of Christ in MATT. xix. 28, "Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel;" and confronted this text with those which I advanced to prove that Christ is to be the final Judge: and he argued that I might as well prove the Deity of the twelve Apostles from this passage as the Deity of Christ from those in which he is described as Judge. I simply answer this objection by calling on Mr Porter to produce any one of those splendid descriptions of *the judicial process of the last day* which the Bible contains, in which it is stated that there will be *thirteen* judges! This demand contains a sufficient answer to his argument.

Mr Porter has advanced a good many observations, with reference to the names of God entering into the composition of the names of confessedly created beings; and remarked that, on my principles of reasoning, I ought to argue for the Deity of all such individuals. I ask in reply, how does he prove this? Does he mean to say that if I find the name of "Christ" entering into the composition of the name of "Antichrist" I am consequently to believe that Antichrist is Christ? or that if I observe the letters I.H.S. on a tombstone, I am to believe that the tombstone is *Jesus Hominum Salvator*? But in no case in which the name of God enters into the composition of the name of a confessedly created being could it ever be supposed that the name of God was given as a *proper* appellation to the person so denominated. One of the great designs of the Jewish religion was to form a standing memorial of the *exclusive* Deity of the ONE God of Israel; and one of the subordinate means by which this object was effected was by inserting the name of Jehovah in the composition of the names of persons and places, so as thereby to scatter monuments and proofs of *his* exclusive Godhead; so that when a

Gentile came from his own country to the land of Judea he found in every place so designated a testimony against the Polytheism of his own people, and in favour of the Deity of the *one* God of Israel. Or whenever a Jew who bore a similarly constructed name travelled into another country, he carried with him in that very name a similar proof that the God of Israel was the only true God. But, further, let me examine the import of some of these compound names to which Mr Porter has referred. Jacob was called Israel, not because he was God, but because he had power *with God*, and prevailed. The designation of "Jehovah Jireh," which Abraham gave to the place where he was about to offer up Isaac, signifies "Jehovah will provide ;" and was a *short prophetic declaration*, pointing to the atonement of the Saviour, whom "God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood ;" and of which atonement the presentation of Isaac upon the altar was a type. The name "Jehovah Nissi" was not intended to deify the altar to which it was given by Moses ; but was simply a short sentence equivalent to saying, "Jehovah *is* my banner." And the name of Elijah was equivalent to this sentence, "Jehovah *is* my God." In fact, all these compound names were *short commemorative sentences*, not relating to the objects to which they were given, but intended to be descriptive of facts relating to Jehovah, and to reflect back upon the mind of every person who heard these names pronounced an overwhelming testimony of *his* exclusive Deity. Just as if a ray of light came down from the meridian sun, and, forming an angle on a surface against which it darted, sent back upon the eye of the observer a reflected specimen of the brightness of that great orb from which it originated ; so an emanation of the glory of God coming down from the eternal throne, and meeting, as it were, in an angle in the *name* of Elijah, carried back upon the minds of those who heard that name pronounced a reflected evidence of the Deity of

Jehovah, so as to lead them, by an irresistible influence, from a contemplation of the creature back to a recognition of the majesty and glory of the great Creator. But the title of "Jehovah our righteousness," which is given to Christ in JER. xxiii. 6, is of a *different* nature from those to which I have just referred. In this case the name "Jehovah" was actually given to Christ "the Branch:" whereas, when Abraham called the place where he offered Isaac "Jehovah Jireh," he did not mean to say that the place was Jehovah, or that the place would provide; or, when Moses called the altar "Jehovah Nissi," he did not mean to say that the altar was his banner, but that Jehovah was his "banner." So that we here ascertain a general principle by which to try the value of these compound words—viz., if we can substitute the name of the object in place of the word "Jehovah," and read it in connection with the other word which was connected with Jehovah, then we may infer that the name of "Jehovah" is applicable to the object. Now, if we apply this rule to the cases above adduced, it will appear evident that we cannot say that "the altar is my banner," or "the place will provide;" whereas, if we apply the same rule to JER. xxiii. 6, we shall find that we *may* substitute the name "the Branch" for the name "Jehovah," so as to say "the Branch is our righteousness;" for we read in 1 COR. i. 30 that "Christ is made unto us wisdom and righteousness;" and in ROM. x. 4, that "he is the end of the law for righteousness." Hence it is manifest that, in JER. xxiii. 6, we may interchange the names "Jehovah" and "Christ," so as either to say "Jehovah is our righteousness," or "Christ is our righteousness:" *therefore*, "Christ" is "Jehovah," since there is only *one* righteousness by which we are justified. And, further, on considering the nature of righteousness as implying our standing clear and guiltless by the *transferred* moral merit of another, we must infer that no person less than Jehovah could supply a righteous-



ness to sinful man ; for what creature could perform a *transferable* work ?

I shall now proceed to investigate the principle which Mr Porter has advanced in reference to *subordinate* agency in creation, and the doctrine which he has based upon an assumption of that principle, that Christ was nothing more than an instrument employed by an *infinitely superior* power for the accomplishment of that great work. This doctrine I oppose upon the following grounds :—

This opinion is manifestly inconsistent with the declaration in GEN. i. 1, that “in the beginning *God created* the heavens and the earth,” for here we have no revelation made of an instrument having been employed. And again we read in the third verse, that “God said, Let there be light :” but did a subordinate agent interpose in order to effect its production ? Surely not ; for “God said, Let there be light, AND THERE WAS LIGHT.” Who does not see that the application of Mr Porter’s principle to this passage is calculated to destroy the evidence it contains of the omnipotent efficacy of the *very fiat* of the Eternal, and to extract and obliterate those traces of majesty and power which even a heathen author could recognise as a worthy reflection of the glory of that great Being of whom Moses wrote ! The creation of the world is also described in ISA. xlv. 24, in the following terms, “Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that maketh all things ; that stretcheth forth the heavens *alone* ; that spreadeth abroad the earth *by myself*,” and in ISA. xlv. 12, in the following terms, “I have made the earth and created man upon it : I, *even my hands*, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded.” In these passages there is no allusion whatever to the interference of an *instrumental* cause. In fact, creation is represented in Scripture as so *peculiarly* and *exclusively* the work of Deity, that it would be the very same thing

to imagine that *a creature has been changed into God*, as that a creature could have been the Creator !

But this principle of a subordinate instrument in creation would at once contradict the argument which the Apostle institutes in Rom. i. 20. This passage is as follows, "For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen ; being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse ;" or we may paraphrase it thus, "For the attributes of the Creator, which are in themselves invisible—namely, his eternity, power, and Godhead—are discernible by an obvious inference from a contemplation of those things which he has created : so that the heathen are without excuse." Here the Apostle assumes that creation is a demonstrative proof of the eternity, power, and Godhead of the Creator ; upon the same principle which the Psalmist lays down in the nineteenth Psalm, where he says, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth *his* handywork." Now, I care not, as far as my argument from this passage is concerned, whether you speak of a supreme agent or of a subordinate instrument, or' whether you institute a distinction between a primary and a secondary cause ; for most unquestionably the argument of the apostle in this passage is plainly this—That when we look abroad, with an admiring eye, upon the splendid fabric of the universe, and survey the complicated, yet simple principles, by which the great Architect has cemented and sustained the produce of his power—we necessarily see such outgoings of eternal power and Godhead consolidated with his work that we are irresistibly convinced of the omnipotent supremacy *of the proximate worker* : mark, I say, of the worker ; of the person who comes into *immediate* contact and *direct collision* with the *execution of the work*. For the argument of the Apostle implies that it is *of him* the testimony is made. And observe how it is declared in this text that the

visible creation is a proof not merely of the eternal power, *but of the Godhead* of the Creator ; and also that it does not merely speak of a *sufficiency* of power, but of a power that is *eternal*, which must be a power that cannot be controlled.

But again, this doctrine of a subordinate and finite instrument in creation is contrary to the declaration of the Apostle in ROM. i. 25, where he speaks of the heathen having "worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator." Here there is no mention of a person intervening between the creature and the Creator ; but all beings in existence are, in this text, classed under two denominations—the creature and the Creator : and both are mentioned with such distinctness as to show that a creature could not have been the Creator, nor could the Creator have been a creature.

Further, we read in HEB. iii. 4, "He that *built* all things is God ;" and this declaration is made without any reference to a primary or secondary cause. And I request you to observe that the *builder* is the person who *actually executes* the work ; therefore, whether you represent Christ as the instrument or not, still there is a principle propounded here which proves him to be "God."

I read the following address to Jehovah in NEH. ix. 6, "Thou, even thou, art Lord alone ; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein." Now, might I not as well maintain that the "Jehovah" who is here addressed was a subordinate agent in the hands of some superior Deity, who did not manifest himself in the work, but sat behind the curtain of the universe, as argue that, though it is said of Christ in COL. i. 16, "by him were all things created," yet he was not the Creator, except in this inferior sense ?

But, in fact, creation was not a *work in the sense in which we understand the term*. It was effected, not by "*working*," but by "*commanding*." This is proved by

the passage to which I have already referred in GEN. i. 3, "God said, *Let there be light*, and there was light;" also from Ps. xxxiii. 9, "For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast;" and Ps. cxlviii. 5, "He commanded, and they were created;" and from ISA. xlv. 12, "All their host have I commanded." I ask, then, what was the occasion for a subordinate agent, if the work was achieved by the *fiat* of the Creator? Does not such a doctrine detract from the perfect efficiency of the command of the Eternal? Surely there was nothing for a subordinate agent to effect. And to suppose the intervention of any secondary instrumentality between the command of God and the effect produced would destroy the omnipotence of God by referring the more difficult part of the work to a created and finite instrument, and the *easier* department to the superior being; for surely, it is far easier to *command* than to *do*; it is far easier to *say*, "Let there be light," than actually to generate and produce the light. And Mr Porter would do well to show how a created agent could be of any avail, where there was not any pre-existent matter upon which his *limited* faculties could be brought to bear. For a finite instrument could not *create*. For what, let me ask, is creation? Is it not an origination *from nothing*?—a filling up, as it were, of that unmeasured vacuum which exists by the inherent constitution of all things as ordained of God, between a state of being and a state of nonentity? And what *created* being could conduct anything through that *infinite* process of origination? Surely nothing but the unlimited and unrestricted power of Jehovah could achieve so great a work. In fact, the doctrine which teaches that Christ, as a created and subordinate agent, could create a world, amounts to this—THAT A FINITE POWER PERFORMS EVERYTHING, WHILST THE INFINITE POWER OF GOD PERFORMS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING. I say it again: This doctrine represents the power of Christ as a finite and delegated power, achieving *all*

*things*, whilst the infinite omnipotence of Jehovah—the length, and breadth, and height, and depth of which the highest angel cannot scan—is represented, on Mr Porter's principle, as retaining its lodgment within the nature of Deity, reposing in a state of inactive indolence, whilst the stupendous work of creation was effected by the instrumentality of a subordinate cause. And, at the same time, such is the nature of the work that we would be led to regard the *immediate* agent by whom the power was actually exerted as our Creator and our God.

But let me suppose for a moment that Christ, as a created being, was the subordinate instrument in the creation of the world. I ask, then, whether did God impart to him a *finite* or an *infinite* power, as a qualification for the work? Let me examine this dilemma: Suppose I am answered that God imparted to Christ an infinite power, I reply at once that this would represent him as conveying over to a *creature* (for the *supposition* is that Christ is a creature) an incommunicable attribute of Deity. It would also involve a supposition of the existence of *two* omnipotent beings—the being who originally had infinite power in himself, and the being to whom that infinite power was imparted. But it requires only an exercise of the first principles of common sense to know that the existence of two distinct omnipotent beings is a philosophical absurdity; because, if one be omnipotent, he must *necessarily* possess control and power over the other. So that we conclude it to be impossible that God, as an infinitely superior being, could have imparted omnipotence to Christ; as he would, by doing so, have surrendered even his own infinite superiority. But I may be told that he only communicated a *finite* power to Christ to enable him to create. I call, then, on Mr Porter to prove how a *finite* power could be *sufficient* for the execution of so great a work. Perhaps he will answer, that, because creation is in itself *finite*, a *finite* power

could be able to create. But mark the sophism which is involved in this reply : it assumes that the word "finite" has the same signification in the two clauses of the sentence ; whereas this word, when applied to creation, is a term of *quantity*, but when applied to power, is a term of *quality*. And, therefore, there is no such analogy between a "finite power" and a "finite creation ;" and the answer is nothing more than a mere play on words. Consequently, the doctrine which supposes that a finite power is sufficient for creating must fall to the ground.

But, again, let us imagine this doctrine to be true. I should like, then, to know what proof has any man that God is *omnipotent*, if a finite power could create. Is it not by a reference to the works of creation that we usually argue for the uncontrolled and illimitable power of the Eternal ? And if creation cannot demonstrate the omnipotence of Jehovah, does it not follow that he has achieved nothing by which to prove the boundless nature of his physical power ? But I have said enough to warrant me in drawing this general conclusion, that creation *is* the work of Deity—that the omnipotence of the Creator *is* written, in legible characters, upon the visible structure of the material universe ; and that, as Christ is revealed in Scripture as the being by whom "all things were created," he must be omnipotent, and, therefore, God.

But before I conclude this address, I must refer you to a passage upon which those who agree with Mr Porter are accustomed to lay considerable stress, and which he has advanced to-day as an argument against the true Deity of Christ. The passage I allude to is to be found in JOHN xiv. 28, "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto my Father ; *for* my Father *is* greater than I." When Mr Porter quoted the latter clause of the text, he omitted altogether the former clause, "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto my Father ;" and by doing so, he left



an impression upon the meeting that the clause, "My Father is greater than I," is the *primary* and *prominent* sentence in the text, whereas it is evident, from its being connected with the preceding part of the verse by the word "for" (which is a small word of three letters, the grammatical use of which is to marry one part of a sentence to another), that it is a *subordinate* part of the passage, the meaning of which is *qualified* by the words which go before. I shall now explain the passage upon this principle; and, first, I request you to observe, that Christ does not say, "My Father *was* greater than I," in reference to his pre-existent glory; nor "My Father *will be* greater than I," in reference to the glory which he was to resume after his exaltation; but he uses a style of expression which shows that he refers to the *present* time—to the time of his humiliation in the flesh. The Apostles had been expressing regret at the announcement of his immediate departure, and this passage contains a soft rebuke of the selfishness of their feelings. We may paraphrase it thus: "If ye really loved me on *my own* account—if the regard and affection you profess to entertain were purely disinterested in its nature—so far from evincing sorrow at the prospect of my departure, you would rejoice that I shall leave this state of temporary degradation, that I shall cease to be the man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, and that I shall resume that original and essential glory which I enjoyed with the Father from eternity. For as long as I continue in my present state of humiliation, my Father *is* greater *in glory* than I; but when the days of my flesh shall terminate, I shall then be glorified with the Father's *own self* with that glory which I had with him before the world was created." This is obviously the correct paraphrase of the passage, for no other interpretation of the words, "For my Father is greater than I," could justify or attach any force to the interesting appeal which the Saviour makes to the love and affection of his disciples. This text, there-



fore, when rightly understood, affords no objection against the Deity of the Saviour, but refers only to that temporary condition, during the continuance of which he "made himself of no reputation."

MR PORTER.—Mr Bagot has told us that the term "*infinite*," as applied to the *works of creation*, is a term of *quantity*; and that the same term, as applied to the *power exerted in creation*, is a term of *quality*. I beg therefore to ask him, if, when applied to *power*, it be a term of *quality*, what is the particular description or *quality* of power which it denotes? Does it denote *moral* power, or *physical* power, or *metaphysical*? Or, if none of these, *what other sort* or classification of power?

MR BAGOT.—I consider that I have explained myself in a sufficiently satisfactory manner to the meeting. I will not be drawn into any metaphysical subtleties or disquisitions. I look upon the subject of our discussion to be simply a question of *fact*, to be established by the production of *testimony*.

## FOURTH DAY.

MR BAGOT.—Before I proceed to answer the remainder of Mr Porter's arguments, there are a few positive and affirmative positions into which my two propositions may be subdivided ; in support of which I wish to advance, in a summary way, a few positive and affirmative proofs in addition to what I have already given :—

1st, I believe that we ought to address our prayers to the Divine Being—for which I refer to the proofs contained in the following passages : PHIL. iv. 6, 7 ; 1 TIM. ii. 1, 2, 3 ; 1 JOHN iii. 22.

2d, I believe that we ought to direct our prayers to the Father, and to worship him as well as the Son—for proof of which I refer to the example of Christ himself, “in the days of his flesh,” who frequently prayed to the Father, not only in public but in private ; and also to the examples of the Apostles, recorded in ACTS iv. 24-30, &c.

3d, I believe that we ought to pray *through* Christ, as Mediator—for proof of which I refer to ROM. i. 8, &c.

4th, I believe that Christ, *as Mediator*, is subordinate to the Father, who sustains the higher office in the mediatorial plan of the Gospel. This is proved by JOHN iii. 35 ; viii. 26-28 ; x. 18 and 32 ; xii. 49, 50 ; xvii. 7, 8 ; ACTS x. 38 ; ROM. xv. 6 ; EPHES. i. 16, 17 ; iii. 14, 15 ; HEB. ii. 9 ; REV. i. 1 ; ii. 27. You may perceive that Mr Porter has been acting as an animated Concordance for me, for which I here take the opportunity to return him my best thanks.

Mr Porter yesterday alluded to *two* distinct senses in which the term “worship” is used in Scripture : 1st, as denoting the homage which is paid to God by his creatures ; and, 2dly, as denoting that external respect which we pay to a superior *fellow*-creature. In these I fully concur ; and I also agree with him in considering that the instances which he referred to (in GEN. xxiii. 7 ; xlix. 8 ; MATT. xviii. 26 ; LUKE xiv. 10 ; REV. iii. 7-9) are very clear and satisfactory instances of this secondary kind of worship ; but I caution him not to use these instances in order to dilute the meaning of the term *worship* when applied to Christ, because they will equally dilute the meaning of the same term when applied to the Father. There is no higher Greek word denoting worship than προσκυνεω, which is applied to Christ in HEB. i. 6 and elsewhere ; and is the same word which Christ himself uses, in JOHN iv. 23, 24, to denote the highest kind of worship, “worship in spirit and in truth,” which is given to the Father : “The hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshippers (προσκυνηται) shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth,” (προσκυνήσουσι τῷ Πατρὶ).

Now, upon Mr Porter’s principles, he must admit that προσκυνήσουσι, “shall worship,” is here used in its highest sense ; and I therefore infer, from the parallelism of the two passages, that it is also used in its highest sense in HEB. i. 6.

Mr Porter adduced the instance recorded in DAN. ii. 46, of NEBUCHADNEZZAR worshipping Daniel. I ask him, in reply, does he mean to confront the act of an idolatrous and heathen king with the command of God the Father, in HEB. i. 6, “Let all the angels of God worship Christ” !

He also referred to 1 CHRON. xxix. 20, where, on DAVID’s commanding the people to “bless the Lord their God,” it is added, that “the people bowed their heads, and worshipped God and the king.” I ask him, in reply, does he not know that the Jewish

government was a *theocracy*—that God was *really* their King, and that the words, “God and the King,” may both refer to the one Jehovah ; and this interpretation renders the obedience which the people gave to DAVID’S command commensurate with what he desired them to do. He only desired them “to bless the Lord their God,” but said nothing about worshipping himself.

In reply to my argument from the prayers of STEPHEN, recorded in ACTS vii. 59, 60, Mr Porter argued that Christ was visible to STEPHEN when he presented these prayers to him. I request you, in reply, to look to the passage, and you will find that STEPHEN had seen the vision in the council-hall *within the city*, and that it was not until they had cast him *out of the city* (as stated in ver. 58) that he offered up these prayers. But what difference could the fact of STEPHEN’S *seeing* Christ make ? How does Mr Porter prove that it is no idolatry to *offer direct prayer*, and *ascribe divine power* to a creature if that creature be *only seen at the time* ? Surely, if it makes any difference, it is this—it renders the idolatry of STEPHEN ten times worse—for if he had seen Jesus (a creature, on Mr Porter’s principles) standing at the right hand of God, he should not have diverted and turned away his prayers from the Creator to a creature !

In order to answer my argument from HEB. i. 6,—“When he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him,”—Mr Porter has informed us, that Christ is *personally present* with the angels in heaven ; and that, therefore, *they* may worship him without idolatry. I ask him, in reply to this, Does he mean to argue, upon this principle, that the object of *religious* worship should be *personally absent* ? If so, let him mark the consequence which follows—viz., the Father is the object of *religious* worship to the angels in heaven ; therefore, according to Mr Porter’s principles, the Father is not in heaven !

He has also made a strange assertion, that, when Paul prayed to Christ, he had appeared to him, and was personally present and visible to him. I answer, that he cannot prove this, in reference to Christ's humanity, for there is not a single word in the passage which could lead us to draw this inference ;—and I should be sorry that Mr Porter should become obnoxious to the curse of adding to the word of God : and we are told, that the heavens were to receive the humanity of Christ, "*until the times of the restitution of all things.*" But if he means that Christ was personally present as to his superior nature, I fully grant it ; because, as I believe in his Deity, I believe him to be in that respect omnipresent.

Mr Porter yesterday told us that "any Unitarian would gladly worship Christ if he was present, just as he said that Stephen and Paul did." I now ask him, is he willing to abide by this declaration ? If so, let him worship Christ this instant ; *for he has said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."*

Mr Porter yesterday pledged his character as a scholar that ACTS ix. 14,—"*those that call upon thy name,*"—and 1 COR. i. 2,—"*those that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ*"—might be translated, "*those that are called by the name,*" &c. I am sorry he would sell his reputation as a scholar at so cheap a price ; for he ought to have known, from a mere historical fact, that this interpretation will not answer for ACTS ix. 14, as believers in Christ were not called by his name until some years afterwards, at Antioch, "*where the disciples were first called Christians.*"

But I still further say, that the structure of the Greek will not admit of the translation which he has proposed. When the verb *ἐπικαλεῶ* signifies to be called *by* the name *of*, it is construed with the preposition *ἐπι*, as in ACTS xv. 17 ; *ἐφ' οὗς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπ' αὐτούς*. And I would add that the verb *ἐπι*-

καλεω is used in the Septuagint version of GEN. iv. 26, xii. 8, and xiii. 4, in the sense of praying to and worshipping Jehovah. Also in ROM. x. 12, 13: "For the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him (εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν); for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord (ὁς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται) shall be saved;" (a quotation from JOEL ii. 32, spoken of *Jehovah* by the prophet, and here applied to Christ by the apostle);—and in 1 PET. i. 17, we find the same word applied to the Father, where we read, "If ye call on the Father," &c. (εἰ Πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε).

Mr Porter yesterday asserted that Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, in the prayer of STEPHEN in ACTS vii. 59, might be translated, "Lord of Jesus." Alas! alas! did he not know that these words *must* be rendered in apposition to each other, since there is no article dividing them, and that the phrase "Lord of Jesus" should be Κύριε τοῦ Ἰησοῦ!

He next referred to REV. i. 4, 5, "From him who is, and was, and is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne; and from Jesus Christ, the faithful and true Witness:" and he argued that the apostle here refers to seven *created* spirits, and that I might as well argue for *their* Deity, as for the Deity of Christ on the ground of his being included in the similar benedictions of Paul: but I ask, how did it happen that he did not at once see that as the Father and Son are here described by a *periphrasis*, the consistency of the text requires that the words, the "seven spirits before his throne," should also be regarded as a periphrastical description of a person?—and it is evident, from the context, that this clause is a designation of the Holy Spirit, in allusion to his manifestations to the seven churches.

The number seven is constantly used in Scripture to denote *completeness* or perfection—as in JOB v. 19; PSALM xii. 6; PROV. vi. 16: and in the book of REVELATION the perfection of God's government is de-

noted by the symbolic agency of seven angels, seven seals, seven plagues, seven phials; and the perfection of Christ's wisdom is described, in REV. v. 6, by the possession of seven horns and seven eyes: therefore, this is just the book in which we naturally expect to find a symbolic designation of the Holy Ghost, as I maintain that the phrase under consideration is.

He next adverted to HEB. i. 8, in which the Father is represented as saying to the Son, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever!" and he stated that this passage might as well be translated thus: "God is thy throne for ever and ever." I must, therefore, examine this criticism. The passage in the Greek is as follows:—Περὶ δὲ τὸν υἱὸν ὁ θεὸς σου, ὁ Θεός, εἷς, τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. And I argue against his proposed rendering of it for the following reasons:—

1. It would destroy altogether the use for which the Apostle made the assertion, or the connection of the clause with his general argument. His object in the chapter is to show the superiority of Christ to angels. But Mr Porter's rendering of the text would destroy this object, since God is, in a figurative sense, the foundation of the throne of every one who sits upon a throne. He is the foundation of the thrones, dominions, and principalities in heavenly places, as well as of the mediatorial throne of Christ.

2. It is very easy to understand the expressions—"God is a sun"—"God is a shield"—or "God is a rock," to which Mr Porter alluded; but it would be difficult to understand the expression, "God is thy throne," without introducing into the passage some ellipsis to explain it, which we cannot do.

3. If this proposed translation be correct, the word *θεός*, as the predicate of the proposition, should more naturally be without the article.

4. As the person who sits upon the throne is greater than the throne itself, his proposed rendering of the



text would give to Christ all the prominence and superiority over the Father, which would be blasphemous.

So that I ask, on what principle does he argue for this translation? It cannot be by *Licentia Poetica* : it must be by some new figure of rhetoric of which I am not aware, and which, until he tells me its proper name, I shall designate *Licentia Unitariana* !

But in connection with HEB. i. 8, he referred to PSALM xlv., which he applied to *Solomon* ; but, I ask, where was his proof for such application? He quoted, indeed, the title of the Psalm, "A Song of Loves ;" but did he not know that the titles of the Psalms are no part of the inspired original, and have no *authority* whatever? He yesterday alluded to Bishop HORSLEY, which led me to imagine that he had read his works ; but had he read the Bishop's Sermons on PSALM xlv. he never would have hazarded so gratuitous, so unproved, and so unprovable an opinion as that PSALM xlv. refers to Solomon. Does he not know that the "*testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy?*" Does he not know that David, in spirit, spoke of Christ?—and has he not read the last verse of this Psalm, "I will make thy name to be remembered in all generations ; therefore shall the people praise thee for ever and ever ;" which never could be applied, in any sense, to Solomon? I beg to inform him that PSALM xlv. refers to the mystical and spiritual union which subsists between Christ and his Church. He referred to the fact of the Queen being spoken of as accompanied by Virgins that be her fellows, as a difficulty in the Psalm ; but let me tell him that the Queen is the Church universal, the *Virgins that be her fellows* are the different denominations of Christians—for there are different denominations and different *partitions* between the various denominations which constitute the Catholic Church of Christ. It would indeed be a glorious state of unanimity if no such *partitions* ex-

isted, and that the Church on earth were even now, what it shall be hereafter, “*one fold under one Shepherd* ;” but in the mean time, I say to you, my *Orthodox Presbyterian* fellow-Christians—to you, my fellow-Christians of the *Covenanting Synod*—of the *Secession Church*—of the *Methodist* and *Quaker Connection*, and of the *Independent* denomination,—let us now congratulate one and other that the partition walls that divide us are not so high but that we can even stretch our arms across them, and extend the right hand of Christian fellowship to those from whom we are thus for a time divided !

Mr Porter yesterday argued that τότε υποταγήσεται, in 1 COR. xv. 28, should be rendered, “then shall the Son be MADE subject.” Surely this implies, if it implies anything, that he is not *now* subject ! But I beg to refer him to the difference between the *active* and *passive* voices of this verb, which is proved in this very passage, where both occur. υποτασσω is to arrange under; υποτασσομαι, in the passive, is to be arranged under, or to be subject ; and it cannot mean to be MADE subject, unless by superadding a *passive* signification to the *passive* !

He argued that the title of “*Son of God*” implies that Christ is inferior to God. If so, his title, “*Son of man*,” implies that he is *inferior to man*. Hence Mr Porter must be something lower than a Humanitarian !

He argued that the subjection of Christ to the Father implied *inferiority of nature*. If so, he must have been *inferior in nature* to Joseph and Mary, because he went down to Nazareth, and was *subject* unto them !

He argued that he that is *sent* must be *necessarily* inferior in nature to him that sent him ! I beg to say that the fact is quite the reverse ; for suppose I required to *send* a messenger to any place, do you think I would choose a dog or cat, or any animal of an in-

ferior nature to myself, to be my messenger : I would certainly send a person of the same nature with myself ! But I would here distinctly remark, that *official subordination* never can prove *natural inferiority* ; and *official subordination* involves merely a compliance with the *will* of another, and *nothing more* ; and may be *voluntarily* assumed by an equal, as it was by Christ—for he says, “ Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.”

His criticism on COL. i. 16, that *ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα ἐκτισθῆ* should be, “ *In him were all things created,*” is worth nothing ; because *ἐν* is constantly used in the New Testament in the sense of “ *by,*” and in this very passage it is explained by *διὰ* at the end of the verse. We have, in fact, in this passage three forms of expression, viz. :—

*ἐν αὐτῷ,  
δι’ αὐτοῦ,  
εἰς αὐτόν,*

connecting Christ, in every possible way, as the sustaining, originating, and final cause of the creation of all things. And I would here remark, that if he were only the subordinate instrument in the hands of a superior being, it could not have been said that all things were created “ *for him,*” *εἰς αὐτόν* ; as in that case all things would have been created *for* the being who employed him.

He next referred to 1 COR. iii. 21, 23, “ *Therefore, let no man glory in men, for all things are yours ; whether Paul or Apollos,*” &c. It is quite evident from the context, which Mr Porter read, that the expression, “ *All things are yours,*” is but a figurative mode of asserting that all the ministers of the church are appointed, and all the arrangements of the Gospel made, for the spiritual benefit of the church.

His quotation from JOHN vi. 57, “ *I live by the Father,*” and others of a similar kind, prove *affirmatively* that, in the possession of a derived existence, which is

a necessary attribute of human nature, Christ was a perfect man ; but as to his Deity, we read in JOHN i. 4, " In him was life."

As to JOHN v. 26, " As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself," I call upon Mr Porter to show how a created and finite being could be capable of even receiving the same independent existence as his Creator, so as to " have life *in himself*," as " his Creator *has life in himself*."

As to JOHN v. 20, " The Father sheweth him all things that himself doeth ;" this passage only proves that his knowledge is *commensurate* with the *works* of the Father, which is a knowledge that no creature could contain.

As to COL. i. 19, " It pleased *the Father* that in him should all fulness dwell ;" his quoting this only proves, that the English translation is not, in *his* estimation, quite so inferior to the original as he asserted. The words, "*the Father*," are supplied by the translators ; and I might as well supply the word, "*himself*," and read the text thus : " For it pleased himself that in him should all fulness dwell." And this is only one proof out of many that a new translation of the Scriptures, *faithfully* executed, would be more favourable to the Deity of Christ than the present.

As to JOHN v. 30, " Of myself I can do nothing : as I hear I judge ;" the expression, " do nothing," is here explained to mean that he does nothing, *as Judge*, of himself. And, I ask, could Deity act otherwise ? Would the Supreme God judge the world from *caprice* or *prepossession*, and without a proper examination of evidence for the satisfaction of the persons judged ?

Mr Porter yesterday asserted, when contrasting the Epistles with the Gospels, that what comes from Christ is of the highest authority. I reply, ALL Scripture comes from Christ ; for it was the Spirit of Christ which was in the authors that gave testimony of what

is revealed (1 PET. i. 10, 11 ; GAL. i. 12) : therefore the Epistles are as authoritative as the Gospels.

As to JOHN v. 19, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do." This evidently means that the Father and Son are in such a sense so closely ONE that the Son can do nothing *of himself*, or *independently* of the Father. If he had, on the other hand, said that the Son "*can do of himself what he does not see the Father do,*" then the passage would prove a complete distinction of being and power. And I would here ask Mr Porter to explain how a creature could adopt the latter part of this verse without manifest blasphemy : "For what things soever the Father doeth, the same doeth the Son likewise !"

As to MARTHA'S words, in JOHN xi. 21, 22, "But now I know that whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee ;" I simply reply, that MARTHA here expressed an Arian sentiment, which Christ immediately corrects by claiming the power referred to as his own in the 25th verse, "*I am* the resurrection and the life ; he that believeth *in me*, though he were dead, yet shall he live ;" just as Nicodemus was a Socinian when he said that Christ was only *a man* and *a teacher*, as recorded in JOHN iii. 2 ; for Christ instantly perceived that he was in an unregenerate state, as all Socinians are, and said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

As to Mr Porter's criticism, that wherever Christ uses the personal pronoun "I," he speaks of *his entire person*, I answer that this is *not the fact* ; because he said to his disciples in one place, "Lo, *I* am with you always, even unto the end of the world ;" and in another place he says, "And now I am no more with you : " and these apparently contradictory declarations cannot both be true, unless we refer the latter to his human nature, and the former to his divine nature.

As to his quotation of ACTS ii. 22, "Ye men of Is-

rael, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a *man* approved of God among you by signs," &c. I submit, in reply, the following dilemma: Mr Porter is either a Socinian or he is not; if he is a Socinian, let him say so. Why is he ashamed to acknowledge it? If he is not a Socinian, he has no business to fight with Socinian weapons, and thus to argue upon a principle which he does not believe.

Mr Porter has produced many passages which speak of Christ in reference to his mediatorial subordination, and has argued for his inferiority from them, *totally overlooking others which assert his Deity*. I would again, therefore, illustrate this principle of reasoning. I read, for instance, in ACTS ii. 34, "For David is not ascended into the heavens;" and I might just as well argue that David's soul was not in glory, from an isolated view of this passage of Scripture, *omitting and disregarding other texts which prove it*, as Mr Porter might argue from passages in which Christ is spoken of as man, that he is only man, overlooking others altogether in which he is spoken of as God.

He next referred to MATT. xx. 23, in which Christ is represented as giving the following answer to Zebedee's children, when their mother had solicited that they might sit on his throne with him in his kingdom: "To sit on my right hand and on my left, is not mine to give; but *it shall be given* to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." But, in reply to his objections from this text, I maintain that these words do not, when taken in their strictly obvious meaning, contain any declaration at all inconsistent with the power of Deity; for God does not dispense the glories of his kingdom to those who ask for them through motives of vanity and ambition, as the mother of Zebedee's children did upon this occasion. Such honours are intended for "him that overcometh," REV. iii. 21. The text should be, "To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give; but to them for whom it has

been prepared of my Father ;" *i.e.*, Christ, when on earth *in a state of humiliation*, could not assume those prerogatives which he had for a time laid aside. And that this is its import is evident from REV. iii. 21, where he asserts explicitly the very prerogative which he is here, on the Arian principle, said to disclaim : "To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me in my throne ; even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne." And if any stress should be laid on the latter part of this verse,— "for whom it has been prepared of my Father,"—I refer, in reply, to JOHN v. 19, where it is said, "For what things soever the Father doeth, the same doeth the Son likewise ;" and to the declaration of Christ in JOHN xiv. 2, "*I go to prepare a place for you.*"

He next referred to 1 COR. xi. 3 : "The head of every man is Christ ; the head of the woman is the man ; and the head of Christ is God." But I reply, that this cannot be spoken of Christ in his divine nature, as it would then be equivalent to saying that "God is the head of God." It *must*, therefore, refer to his subordinate office as Mediator. And it is an enumeration of the parties concerned in the mediatorial scheme—*Man*, who is to be reconciled ; *Christ*, the Mediator, who reconciles ; *God*, with whom the reconciliation is effected. And this passage plainly states the order in which the parties stand.

---

I MUST NOW PROCEED TO EXAMINE THE ARGUMENTS WHICH MR PORTER HAS ADVANCED IN SUPPORT OF HIS OPINION, AS STATED IN HIS SECOND PROPOSITION : THAT CHRIST IS, IN HIS HIGHEST CAPACITY, NATURE, OR CONDITION, A CREATED BEING.

The first proof which he advanced in support of this doctrine was derived from REV. iii. 14, where Christ is styled "the beginning of the creation of God." But upon this passage I would remark that,

By a common metonymy, the *abstract* term is put for



the *concrete* (as in 1 JOHN i. 2, where Christ is styled “that eternal life which was with the Father”); for when *αρχη* is applied to a *person*, and does not refer to *time*, it generally signifies *the chief*, or *principal*: As for instance, in the Septuagint—

EXOD. vi. 25: *Αυται αι αρχαι πατριας λευιτων*, these are the *heads* of the family of the Levites.

NEH. ix. 17: *Εδωκαν αρχην*, they appointed a captain.

HOS. i. 11: *Θησονται εαυτοις αρχην μιαν*, they shall appoint for themselves one *head*.

In the New Testament, *αρχαι*, *powers*, is frequently used for *αρχοντες*, *rulers*; as in

LUKE xii. 11: unto magistrates and powers.

ROM. viii. 38: nor principalities nor powers.

EPH. iii. 10: unto the principalities and powers.

EPH. vi. 12: against principalities.

COL. i. 16: principalities.

In all of which the original term is *αρχαι*.

But further, in COL. i. 18, we find this very title given to Christ, *in the sense of having the pre-eminence*: “And he is the head of the body, the church, who is the beginning (*αρχη*), the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence;” and in Rev. i. 5, a passage parallel to Rev. iii. 14, Christ is styled “the Prince of the kings of the earth” (*ὁ ἀρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς*). And I may also add that *αρχη*, in the language of ancient philosophy, denoted an *efficient cause*—that which *gave a beginning to other things*—a principle or *source* of existence.

I therefore conclude that this passage in Rev. iii. 14 may be thus translated: “These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, THE CHIEF OR LORD of the creation of God.” And, in that case, it will be parallel with the declaration of Christ in MATT. xxviii. 18, “*All power* is given unto me in heaven and in earth.”

But I wish to know, Does Mr Porter understand by this declaration, which says that Christ was the “be-

ginning of the creation of God," as it is rendered in our version—does he, I say, understand by it that Christ was the *first-created* being? or, in other words, that there was a time before which he did not exist? If so, let him mark the consequence of his argument. Christ says in REV. xxi. 6, "I am the beginning and the end"—ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. He is, therefore, the END as well as the BEGINNING. Now I naturally argue, that, if the fact of Christ's being called the "BEGINNING," implies that there *was* a time before which he did not exist; then his being called the "END" must, upon the same principles, imply that there *will* be a time after which he will not exist! that is, that Christ will be annihilated, and cease to exist! To such an awful length do the principles of reasoning adopted by those who deny the Deity of the Saviour lead!

The next argument which Mr Porter advanced in support of his opinion,—that Christ in his highest capacity is a created being,—was drawn from COL. i. 15, in which he is styled "the first-born of every creature"—πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. To this argument I answer, that the title πρωτότοκος, "first-born," cannot denote that Christ was created, for the following reasons:—

1. The passage is not πρωτοκτιστος πάσης κτίσεως, "first-created of every creature," which would have been the correct way of conveying the doctrine of Christ's having been the *first-created* being.

2. The *reason* which follows in ver. 16,—"*for* by him were all things created,"—would be most absurd: for what could the Apostle mean by saying, "Christ is the first-created being, *because* he created all things"? If there be any consequence in the reason given, it would imply that Christ created himself; as it is not said, that "by him were all *other* things created."

For these reasons I reject the signification which

Mr Porter has attached to this word ; and I shall now explain it.

The term *πρωτότοκος*, “first-born,” was in frequent use among the Jews, as denoting the lord, proprietor, or prince—just as the corresponding Hebrew term בְּכוֹר was so used : as in EXOD. iv. 22, and in JER. xxxi.

9, Israel and Ephraim are respectively designated the “first-born” of God, because they were distinguished by the peculiar favour of Jehovah, and placed in a situation of eminence above all nations. The “first-born” is the “heir,” the *κληρονόμος*, who is described by the Apostle, in GAL. iv. 1, as the “lord of all,” *κύριος πάντων*. So that *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, “first-born of every creature,” is explained by HEB. i. 2 and 6 ; where the Apostle says of Christ, in the former verse, that the Father “hath appointed him heir of all things,” *ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων* ; and immediately afterwards styles him “first-born,” *πρωτότοκον*, in the sixth verse. And in other passages, where the Apostle styles Christ the “first-born,” it is in the sense of “principal,” or “chief ;” as in ROM. viii. 29, where he styles him “first-born among many brethren ;” and in COL. i. 18, where he styles him “first-born from the dead.” And, in HEB. i. 6, he is represented, under the title of “first-born,” as the person whom the angels “worship ;” and it is evident that, if the term denoted that he was the “first-created” being, this passage would represent God the Father as teaching creature-worship contrary to ROM. i. 25, in which idolatry is defined to be “worshipping and serving the creature besides the Creator.”

I therefore conclude, that the term “first-born” means the “proprietor” or “ruler ;” and then the explanation, “*For* by him all things were created,” &c., which immediately follows, is intelligible ; for then we understand the Apostle as saying that “Christ is the proprietor or ruler of every creature, *because* by him

all things were created." He who created is Lord by right of creation.

I may here add, that, even if the term *πρωτότοκος* could mean that Christ was created, *still* the structure of the sentence should be different from what it is. It should be *πρωτότοκος ἐν πασι κτισμασι*; for, in that case, *πρωτοτοκος* should not be followed by a simple genitive, but should be followed by a preposition governing the following noun substantive; as in ROM. viii. 29, *πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*.

I may also add that the word *πρωτοτοκος* might have an *active* signification in this passage, and be translated as "the first-producer of every creature;" for the word is often used in an *active* sense in the best Greek authors, as in HOMER, *Iliad*, 17, line 4 and 5 :

ὥς τις περὶ πρόστακι μήτηρ  
Πρωτοτόκος, κινυρῇ, οὗ πρῶν εἶδυ' ἅ τ' ἔκκοιο.

Having thus replied to the arguments which Mr Porter has advanced in support of his position, that Christ is a created being, I now submit the following direct arguments against this opinion :—

1. It is nowhere asserted in Scripture. From the evident parallelism between JOHN i. 1, &c., and GEN. i. 1, &c., we might have expected the Apostle to have asserted the creation of Christ, or of the Word, in the very commencement of his Gospel; for it would have rendered the parallelism more complete to have said, "*ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν τὸν Λόγον ὁ Θεός, &c.*"—It is therefore manifest, that the reason why he did not say so was, because Christ was an uncreated being.

2. It is said in JOHN i. 3, and in COL. i. 16, that "by him were all things created"—Therefore, if Christ was created, he must have been created by himself; for it is not said that by "him were all *other* things created."

3. In ROM. i. 25 the Creator and creature are so placed in contrast as to show that the Creator could

not have been a creature, nor could a creature have been the Creator : but by Christ were all things created ; therefore he could not have been a creature.

4. If Christ were a creature, then it would involve the commission of idolatry to obey the command in HEB. i. 6, "Let all the angels of God worship him : " for the Apostle defines idolatry to be "worshipping and serving the creature more than" (or rather "besides") "the Creator."

5. Christ is said, in COL. i. 17, to have been before *all* things—*i.e.*, as is evident from the context, before all created things ; and, therefore, as he could not *be* before himself, he could not have been created : for it is not said that "he is before all OTHER created things."

6. He is called "*Eternal* life" in 1 JOHN i. 2, in reference to the *pre-existence* which he had with the Father.

7. It is said, in HEB. vii. 3, that Melchisedek *was made like to* (ὁμοιωμένος) the Son of God, in having neither beginning of days nor end of years ; therefore Christ was, *in reality*, what Melchisedek *resembled* him in, *i.e.*, eternal.

8. It would have added so much to the glory of Jehovah, to say that he had created so glorious a being as "the Word," that, if true, we would have expected this declaration to have illuminated every page of Scripture ; and that the advocates of this opinion would not have been obliged to adduce one or two figurative expressions, such as those in COL. i. 15, and in REV. iii. 14, which are the only show of argument that can be advanced in support of it.

For these reasons, I maintain that Christ was not, as to his superior nature, a created being, but was the God who created all things.

---

I shall now advance an additional argument in support of the true Deity of Christ, distinct from those

which I have already advanced in the previous course of this Discussion. This argument I shall illustrate by proofs in detail, having first stated it under the following three propositions :

1. We read of an angel, throughout the Old Testament, who frequently appeared to men, bearing the titles, possessing the attributes, receiving the homage, and exercising the prerogatives of Deity ; and who was recognised as God by those to whom he appeared.

2. This angel was not God the Father.

3. He was God the Son.

I submit the following passages to illustrate the first of these propositions :\*

GEN. xii. 7. And the Lord *appeared* (נִרְאָה) unto Abraham, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land : and there builded he an altar unto the Lord that appeared unto him.

GEN. xvii. 1. And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord *appeared* to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God, &c.

N.B.—The Hebrew verb rendered “*appeared*,” denotes that the Lord *became visible*.

GEN. xvi. 7-13. And the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness, by the fountain in the way to Shur ; and he said, Hagar, Sarai’s maid, whence camest thou ? and whither wilt thou go ? And she said, I flee from the face of my mistress Sarai. And the *angel of the Lord said unto her*, Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself under her hands. And the *angel of the Lord said unto her*, Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael ; because the Lord hath heard thy affliction, &c. And she called the name of the Lord that *spake unto her*, *Thou God seest me* : for she said, Have I also here looked after him that seeth me ?

---

\* The following texts were not read in full but only referred to by chapter and verse ; but as I publicly stated that if Mr Porter would allow me to print them in full, I should feel obliged to him ; and as he generously gave me that permission in his following speech, they are here printed as I had prepared them.—D. B.

GEN. xviii. 1, 2. And the Lord appeared unto him in the plains of Mamre : and he sat in the tent-door in the heat of the day. And he lifted up his eyes and looked, and lo, three men stood by him : and when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the tent-door, and bowed himself toward the ground.

N.B.—Of these three, one was superior to the rest, and speaks to, and was addressed by, Abraham as Jehovah—ver. 3, 13, 17, 20, 22, 25, 33. In ver. 22 of 18th chap. two of the men are said to have gone towards Sodom ; and in chap. xix. 1, they are said to have arrived there ; and in xix. 13, they represent themselves as being sent by the Lord to destroy Sodom.

GEN. xxii. 11, 12. And the angel of the Lord called unto him out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham. And he said, Here am I. And he said, Lay not thy hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him : for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, *from me*.—See also ver. 15-17.

GEN. xxvi. 2. And the Lord *appeared* unto him, and said, Go not down into Egypt, &c. Ver. 24. And the Lord appeared unto him the same night, and said, I am the God of Abraham thy father, &c.

GEN. xxviii. 11, &c. And he lighted upon a certain place, and tarried there all night. . . . And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder set up on the earth. . . . And behold, *the Lord stood* above it, and said, I am the *Lord God of Abraham* thy father, and the God of Isaac ; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it. . . . And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, &c. . . . Ver. 16. And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, Surely the Lord is in this place : and I knew it not. Ver. 19. And he called the name of that place Bethel.—*Read in connection with this*, chap. xxxi. 11, 13. And the *angel of the Lord* spake unto me in a dream, saying, Jacob. And I said, Here am I. Ver. 13. I am *the God of Bethel*, where thou anointedst the pillar, and where thou *vowedst a vow unto me*, &c.

GEN. xxxii. 24. And Jacob was left alone ; and there wrestled a man with him until the break of day. Ver. 28. And he said, Thy name shall no more be called Jacob, but Israel : for as a prince hast thou power with God, and hast prevailed. Ver. 30. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel : for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.—*Read in connection with this*, HOSEA xii. 4, 5. Yea, he had power over *the angel*, and prevailed ; he wept and made supplication unto him : he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us, even the Lord God of hosts.

GEN. xxxv. 1. And God said unto Jacob, Arise, go up to Bethel, and dwell there ; and make there an altar unto God,



that appeared unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy brother.—But this God that appeared unto him is described in GEN. xxxi. 11 to be the angel of the Lord.

GEN. xlviii. 15, 16. And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk; the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, *the angel* which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.

EXOD. iii. 2. And *the angel of the Lord* appeared unto him in a flame of fire, out of the midst of a bush. Ver. 4. And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, *God* called unto him out of the midst of the bush. Ver. 6. And he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, &c.

EXOD. xiii. 21. And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way.—*Compare this passage with* EXOD. xiv. 19. And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them, &c.

EXOD. xix. 3. And Moses went up unto God, and God called unto him out of the mountain (*i.e.*, Sinai), saying, &c. Now in ACTS vii. 38, the Holy Ghost, speaking through Stephen, says, “This (Moses) is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with *the angel* which spake to him in the Mount Sinai,” &c.

EXOD. xxiii. 20, 21. Behold, I send an angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not: for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my *name is in him*. Ver. 23. For mine angel shall go before thee.—(*This was spoken by the Father of the Son*).

JUDGES ii. 1. “And an *angel* of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, *I made* thee to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the land which I swore unto your fathers.”—Then the angel proceeds, in the two following verses, to represent the language of Jehovah to Moses, recorded in EXOD. xxxiv. 10, 14, as his; and in the 4th verse it is said, “And it came to pass, when *the angel of the Lord* spake these words,” &c.

JUDGES vi. 12. And *the angel of the Lord* appeared unto him, and said unto him, The Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valour. Ver. 13. And Gideon said unto him, O my Lord, if the Lord be with us, why then has all this befallen us? &c. Ver. 14. And the Lord looked upon him, and said, &c. Ver. 16. And the Lord said unto him, &c. Ver. 20. And the *angel of the Lord* said unto him, &c. Ver. 21. Then the angel of the Lord departed out of his sight. Ver. 22. And when Gideon perceived that he was an angel of the Lord, Gideon said, Alas, O Lord God, for because I have seen an angel of the Lord face

to face. Ver. 23. And the Lord said unto him, Peace be unto thee ; fear not, thou shalt not die ; then Gideon built an altar there unto the Lord.

N.B.—The Hebrew words in this passage may be rendered, indifferently, “*an angel*,” or “*the angel*.”

NUMBERS xxii. 12. And God said unto Balaam, Thou shalt not go with them, &c. Ver. 32. And the angel of the Lord said unto him, &c. Ver. 35. And *the angel of the Lord* said unto Balaam, &c.—Chap. xxiii. 4. And God met Balaam, &c. Ver. 5. And the Lord put a word in Balaam’s mouth, &c.—Chap. xxiv. 4. He hath said which heard the words of God, which saw the vision of the Almighty, &c.

In ISAIAH vi. we have another account of the Deity being *manifested* to the Prophet.

MALACHI iii. 1. The coming of “*the angel of the covenant*” to the temple is foretold, and his Deity, and proprietorship of the temple, is asserted in the words, “*The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple.*”

Such is a review of some of the instances in which the angel, Jehovah, is represented as appearing.

I shall now prove that this angel is *God* : for—

The name of God was in him. EXOD. xxiii. 21, “*For my name is in him.*”

He speaks as God, as in EXOD. iii. 2, &c. ; GEN. xxxv. 11 ; xxviii. 13.

Is spoken of as God, as in JUDGES xiii. 22, &c.

Is spoken to as God, as in GEN. xvi. 13, &c.

Was worshipped, and received worship as God, as in GEN. xxxv. 1 ; JUD. xiii. 23, &c. &c.

The second proposition, which asserts that this angel was not God the Father, is proved by—

JOHN i. 18. No man hath seen God at any time : the only-begotten *Son*, which is in the bosom of the *Father*, he hath declared him.

JOHN v. 37. And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me : ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape.

The next proposition, that this angel was Christ in his pre-existent Deity, I maintain for the following reasons :—

1. The analogy which there is between the character of the Angel in the Old Testament, and the character of Christ in the New ; and the similarity which there is between the visions of the Angel Jehovah to Abraham, Jacob, and Moses, and those of Christ glorified to Stephen, to Ananias, and to Paul ; and between the visions of the Angel seen by Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah, and those seen by John—render it *probable* that the Angel was Christ.

2. The offices and relationship to the Jews which the Angel Jehovah is represented in the Old Testament as sustaining, are, in the New Testament, attributed to Christ. The Israelites are called, in JOHN i. 11, Christ's own people ; it was Christ who inspired the prophets, as we are told in 1 PETER i. 11 ; it was he whom they tempted in the wilderness, as we are told in 1 COR. x. 9 ; and it was he who would *often* have gathered them together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, as we are informed by himself in LUKE xiii. 34.

3. When Christ said to the Jews, "Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad ;" they understood this as equivalent to a declaration of his being personally seen by Abraham ; and Christ did not contradict their conception of his meaning, but asserted his priority to Abraham.

4. In HEB. xii. 26 we are expressly told that it was Christ's voice which shook the earth when the law was delivered on Sinai.

5. Paul, in EPH. iv. 8, applies the 68th Psalm to Christ : therefore, we are to consider that Psalm as descriptive of his glory. But in verse 7 we read, "O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people ; when thou wentest through the wilderness," &c. ; and in EXOD. xiv. 19, it is said "that the Angel of the Lord went before " them in the wilderness.

6. It was Christ whom Isaiah *saw* in vision, according to the testimony of JOHN xii. 41.

7. It was Christ who presided over the Jewish church, which is evident from EPH. v. 14, "Wherefore, he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and *Christ* shall give thee light;" which words are a paraphrastical reference to ISA. lx. 1, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of *the Lord* is risen upon thee."

8. In MAL. iii. 1 Christ is expressly called the Angel of the Covenant, and represented also in the same verse as the Lord of the Temple.

From all this I infer that Christ, in his pre-existent Deity, was the Angel of Jehovah, who was Jehovah himself; one with the Father, the President and Patron of the Jewish church.

---

I shall now close this address by a remark which I find it necessary to make. Before I entered upon this discussion I laid it down as a rule to myself that I would not bring forward, in the course of argument, the name of a single *living* individual, unless first introduced by Mr Porter. I state this because I find that some persons have taken offence at the remarks I *felt it my duty* to make yesterday, in reference to the published sentiments of Dr BRUCE. Far be it from me to speak with disrespect or unkindness of that venerable and respected man; nor would I have alluded to him at all, had not Mr Porter *first* brought forward his name in this discussion. And I only wish that Mr Porter had maintained a similar reserve, and had abstained from the offensive language in which he spoke of that kind, affectionate, and venerable man, Dr SAURIN, the Lord Bishop of Dromore.

---

MR PORTER.—Mr Bagot has laid down certain principles upon the Scripture doctrine of worship, with respect to one of which I have a question to propose. He has stated that "God is to be worshipped"—that

“he is to be worshipped through Christ as Mediator;” and lastly, “that Christ himself is to be worshipped.” Now, with reference to the last of these points, I beg leave to ask, when Christians worship Christ, *who mediates between them and THE MEDIATOR.*

MR BAGOT.—The question is absurd; and I shall answer it as Christ answered the Sadducees by proposing another. When Stephen prayed to Christ, who mediated between Stephen and Christ?—or when Paul prayed to Christ, who mediated between Paul and Christ?

MR PORTER.—Since the commencement of the present discussion I have had several distinct intimations of a kind calculated to prevent me from doing justice to the cause of which I am an humble but sincere advocate. I have been made to perceive that an unpopular cause has, in this assembly, a still more unpopular defender. Why this should be so I cannot divine. My conscience acquits me of having made use of any *arts* for the purpose of gaining your assent. I have neither attempted to work upon your feelings, nor to stir up your prejudices, nor to excite your passions. My conscience acquits me of having attempted to divert or distract your attention from the important subjects of the discussion between Mr Bagot and myself. My conscience acquits me of having designedly said anything, or even thought anything, which ought to produce an unfavourable feeling towards me in the minds even of those, whoever they may be, who most dislike the principles for which I contend. I have shunned everything that could hurt their feelings. I have put my plain arguments forward in a plain way, trusting my whole cause to the force of reason and of truth. And shall it be said that in an assembly like the present, where I see before me a number of ministers of the Gospel of various churches, and other persons of different classes, who, from the habit and mode of life to which they are accustomed, ought to know what is

due to a person standing in the responsible station which I now occupy—is it, I ask, to be said that in such an assembly, because I have plainly stated my conscientious convictions in an unvarnished manner, I am to receive intimations to let me know the light in which I am regarded?

I am not the only person in this assembly who is conscious of the fact thus intimated. My reverend opponent also is well aware of it. He knows that he has the feelings of the great majority of the present auditory with him in this discussion; and I am sorry to find that, instead of confining himself to close argument on the subject before us, he has chosen to appeal to your sectarian feelings, addressing you as his "*Presbyterian* friends," his "*Independent* friends," and his "*Covenanting* friends." With reference to such addresses, I shall only say that I hope you are not more sincerely his friends than I am yours. I entertain towards you no feelings but those of kindness; but I should be unwilling and indisposed to appeal to your prejudices, instead of addressing you as rational beings. I should seem to myself to pay you but an ill compliment if I attempted thus to rest the cause on your feelings, and not upon your unbiassed judgment.

I am truly sorry that, in addition to several previous charges of misrepresenting my language and sentiments, which I not only brought forward but *proved* against Mr Bagot on former occasions, I am now obliged to make another complaint of the same kind. That gentleman, alluding to my quotation of the text in which, according to the Common Version, it is declared that "it pleased *the Father* that all fulness should dwell in the Son," has thought proper to assert that I repeated the word "*Father*"—(which is not in the original, but is supplied by the translators to complete the sense)—as if it were part of the text, without giving any intimation to the contrary. I beg leave to say such is not the fact. I do most solemnly declare that I quoted the

text in the very words following, "*For it pleased [him, i.e., the Father, as appears from verse 12], that in him should all fulness dwell ;*" and that I repeated it in the very manner in which I have now read it, as nearly as possible. I ask, could any intimation be given more plainly that the words introduced were so introduced by myself for the purpose of explanation? I beg leave to add that I am above such artifices. I should scorn to impose on you by mere sounds, or by mistranslations, or *erroneous readings*!

Mr Bagot has intimated that in reading COL. i. 12-20, towards the close of my last speech yesterday, I changed the word "*by*" into "*in*," because I thought the latter rendering more favourable to my own views. It is strange that even my *concessions* are treated as *encroachments*! I altered the word "*by*," in the passage, "*For by him were all things created,*" not because I think the preposition "*in*" is more favourable to my own views, for I think it is less so; nor because I think that *ἐν* is incorrectly rendered in the Common Version by the word "*by*," for I am quite sure that the preposition has that meaning, and that in this context it will scarce admit of any other; but I pointed out "*in*" as the more *usual* and more *literal* rendering of the word, only because *such is the fact*; and because I wished to deprive Mr Bagot, and every one else, of all handle or excuse for saying that I would adduce a single passage which I knew to be *questionably* translated, or would build a single argument on the *defects*, and, as it might be argued, the mistakes, of the Common Version. You see how little encouragement I have received to be candid with Mr Bagot, when even my very candour is turned into matter of accusation!

A great many of the observations which Mr Bagot has this day adduced, are of such a nature that they answer themselves. Thus, for instance, he admits that the term *worship* occurs in Scripture in an inferior sense; and several times denotes the homage which



was presented by created beings to their fellow-creatures, to whom respect, reverence, and civil obedience were due ; and yet he cautions you against regarding this secondary meaning of the term as affecting his attempt to establish the necessity of paying divine honours to Christ ; since, as he argues, if the inference be good as affecting the worship paid to Christ, it would be equally valid as applied to the worship of THE FATHER—That is to say, he admits, and cannot deny, that the word has this inferior or secondary sense, and yet argues that the admission of this *indisputable fact* contradicts the duty and necessity of worshipping GOD, THE FATHER ! Might I not be authorised, after listening to such an argument, to inquire whether Mr Bagot means to deny that worship, religious worship, is due to God, the Father ? My theory does not carry me so far. I admit both the primary and secondary meaning of the term *worship* ; and the principle for which I contend, and contended, is, that we are to find out from the context, and from considering all the circumstances of each particular case, whether it is civil homage or religious worship that is intended whenever the term occurs in Scripture.

Mr Bagot, again, admitted expressly that the epithet “*first-born*”—or in the Greek (if I must speak Greek, which I have no desire to do in a promiscuous assembly), *πρωτότοκος*—is applied to Israel in the Old Testament Scriptures in that language ; and yet, with a perverse inconsistency, he argued from the application of that very term to our Lord Jesus Christ, that our blessed Saviour must be God Supreme ! I, at least, have endeavoured not to trifle in this manner with your understandings. I have, at least, endeavoured to avoid the production of suicidal arguments, which are no sooner stated than refuted.

A great deal of what he has this day stated might be refuted with the same facility. Some of his arguments, however, cannot so easily be answered ; because

he has now improved upon his former practice of parrotting over his texts so rapidly that it was impossible to annex any distinct ideas to the words. On a former occasion I gave him a lesson on this subject, which I imagined would have left an impression, and prevented any recurrence of the evil ; but he is like those perverse pupils who only grow the worse the more pains you take to improve them. To-day he has not been content to parrot over his texts, but has satisfied himself with simply announcing *the references to chapter and verse*, without repeating the words at all ; and even this with a volubility which would induce me to think he takes it for granted that you will, with implicit faith, admit his interpretation of every text referred to ; and not only so, but that you do *now* receive every reference which he has announced, as convincing proof that he is a good logician and a sound theologian. Be it so then ! Take it thus for granted. He has the advantage of your feelings on his side. Anything that comes from him will not fail to carry conviction along with it, though it be simply the running over an arithmetical enumeration of passages. But he asks, will I give him leave to publish at full length, in the printed report, the words of all the texts to which he has thus referred ? I answer in the exercise of the same openness, at this advanced stage of the discussion, which I have evinced throughout—I DO. I am neither afraid of him nor his texts. I am sure that when all the passages to which he has referred appear in print, and when they are subjected to a calm, rational, impartial, and sober judgment, they will carry with them the refutation—not of themselves, for that is what never can be effected—but of those doctrines which he has built upon them ; while the principles for which I have contended in this discussion will stand untouched, based as they are upon the explicit and oft-repeated testimony of the word of God. Mr Bagot's mode of

arguing the question, by referring to texts without giving the words, precludes the possibility of an answer to the majority of the points embraced in his speech. I am utterly unable, I candidly confess, to reply to arguments which I have not been permitted to hear. I shall therefore not attempt what I own to be beyond my power, but proceed to consider a subject to which I yesterday announced that I should this day apply myself—the doctrine of two natures united in the one person of Christ the Mediator. I bring this question forward on the present occasion the more willingly, because, as Mr Bagot is to follow me in the debate, he will thereby have an opportunity of answering my reasoning, if he thinks it admits or deserves a reply.

The doctrine of the divine and human natures being united in the mediatorial person of Christ, has been frequently insisted on by Mr Bagot since the commencement of this discussion, although he has never once favoured us with any express and formal proof of the position. Indeed, it is a point which other controversialists, as well as Mr Bagot, have found it far more convenient to assume than to prove. I might, as I have intimated, reserve my observations for my last speech, to which Mr Bagot will have no opportunity to reply ; but to enable him to make good his case, if he can, I choose to bring them forward now.

As Mr Bagot's own language is not particularly calculated to make a definite impression on my mind, I shall take my statement of this doctrine from the Athanasian Creed, which he is bound to say or sing thirteen times every year, and which, of course, it is fair to assume, expresses his sentiments. Indeed, it is one of the things contained in the Book of Common Prayer, to the whole and every part of which he has declared his unfeigned assent and consent ; and it is sanctioned by one of those thirty-nine articles of religion, which he has subscribed, in token of agreement with their literal and grammatical sense. In this sym-

bol, the doctrine of the two natures in Christ is thus expressed :—

“Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that [a man] also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

“For the right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man.

“God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the world ; and man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world.

“Perfect God and perfect man ; of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting.

“Equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching his manhood.

“Who, although he be God and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ.

“One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God.

“One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person.

“For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.”

Such is the doctrine of two natures in the one person of Christ the Mediator, which I propose to subject to a brief scrutiny.

The regular and orderly mode of considering a question of this kind, is to settle, first, the meaning of the terms. I assume then, as the signification of the word *person*, a definition given by high authority: “A thinking, intelligent being ; an individual being that can consider itself as itself.” And I further assume that, when we speak of the *nature* of a thing, we mean its properties, qualities, or attributes, considered collectively.

The *nature* of God, therefore, or *the divine nature*, means the same as *the aggregate of the qualities* of God—that is, all the qualities of God taken together : and, in like manner, *the human nature*, or *the nature* of man, denotes *that union of qualities*, properties, or attributes, which are found in man. The doctrine of two natures in one person means, that the qualities,

properties, or attributes of man, are united with those of God, in the same individual, thinking, intelligent being.

Now, it is the nature or property of *God* to be *Eternal* in duration, *Infinite* in power, *Infinite* in wisdom, *Infinite* in goodness. And in like manner it is the quality or the nature of *man* to be *originated* in time, *limited* in power, *limited* in wisdom, and *limited* in goodness.

When we say, therefore, that the *two natures*—the divine and the human—are united *in one person*, we affirm that the same individual is *eternal* in duration, yet had his *origin* in time ; that he is *infinite* in wisdom, and yet *limited* in wisdom ; that he is *infinite* in power, yet *limited* in power ; and that he is *infinite* in goodness, yet *limited* in goodness. Now, if this be not a contradiction—a series of contradictions—I confess I think *it comes as near to it* as can well be conceived. If it be really a contradiction in terms, *it cannot possibly be true*. This is one of the maxims of that logical art, of which Mr Bagot talks so much and shows so little.

I pass over this argument, however, and come to consider the testimony of Scripture on the subject, with as much impartiality as if no such objection could be urged against the doctrine *in limine*. It will, however, I hope, be granted to me by all candid Trinitarians—and I am persuaded there are many such among those who hear me—that the testimony of Scripture, adduced in favour of an opinion such as this, ought to be plain, precise, and definite. What are the proofs usually adduced ? Mr Bagot has not favoured us with any distinct argument on the point. Others, however, have adduced such texts as 1 TIM. iii. 16 : “ *God was manifest in the flesh.* ” But this reading is rejected as spurious by GRIESBACH, who, as I stated on the first day of this discussion, was an avowed believer in the

Trinity, and whose integrity I never before heard called in question ; as well as by Dr WARDLAW of Glasgow, Mr CARLILE of Dublin, and a whole host of orthodox authorities besides : while others among them, including Professor MOSES STUART of Andover and the *Eclectic* and *Quarterly* Reviewers, consider it as a reading so extremely *doubtful* and *uncertain* that no argument can be built upon it. I need not, therefore, examine the authenticity of this reading in detail. The judgment of the critics whom I have named, is, I humbly submit, more than sufficient to outweigh the opinion of my reverend opponent. And with respect to the parenthesis, which he contends ought to be inserted if GRIESBACH's reading be followed, I can only say, that I can see no proof of its necessity, and respectfully refuse to admit it upon his authority. I may be allowed, however, to state, as Mr Bagot has referred to the Alexandrian MS. in support of the reading "*God*" in this text, that my attention being turned to the subject during my residence in London by a pamphlet of Dr HENDERSON's, I had the curiosity to go to the British Museum to inspect that celebrated MS. which is there preserved ; and, unquestionably, the word ΘC (Θεός) "*God*" is found in this passage ; but, equally beyond question, the strokes which make the difference between this reading and OC (ὁς), "*he who*" (the reading preferred by GRIESBACH), are a *modern addition*, differing entirely in colour of ink, and in style of execution, from the rest of the MS. The corresponding strokes in other parts of the MS. are beautifully finished, and appear as sharp and as well defined as if they had been traced with the point of a needle ; whereas, those which are found in this place are rough blotches, rather than lines ; and the ink in them is black and fresh, while that of the adjacent letters is pale and faded by the lapse of many centuries.

Another passage which has been brought forward to

prove this doctrine occurs in ROM. ix. 3-5, which I shall read from the Common Version.

For I could wish (says the Apostle) that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh ; who are Israelites ; to whom [pertaineth] the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service [of God], and the promises ; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.

Mr Bagot, by his *over eagerness* to prejudice your minds against such a mode of translating this passage, has already apprised you that the last clause may be thus rendered :—

Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, *who is over all.* GOD [be] BLESSED FOR EVER !

The passage therefore only declares, that Christ, who, according to the flesh, was born of the lineage of David, was the greatest of all the instances of God's kindness to his people ; and concludes with a devout thanksgiving to God for his mission. It is, indeed, hard to conceive how an argument for this extraordinary doctrine can be deduced from such a text as this. I observe, moreover, that Mr Bagot, more than once, in quoting this text, misplaced two of the members of the last clause, in a way which is very frequently practised by orthodox preachers and advocates ; so that, instead of "*Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever,*" he converted it into a form which not even King James's Trinitarian translators thought proper to adopt : "*Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for ever.*" If it be asked, wherein the difference between the two renderings consists, I answer, It consists in this : that the latter mode, by dislocating the members of the sentence, makes the suggested rendering (*God [be] blessed for ever*) appear forced, strange, and unnatural ; whereas, if the words were left in their proper order, a very different impression would be made



on the mind of any intelligent and inquiring person, though unacquainted with Greek.

An argument has been built on the declaration in COL. ii. 9, which affirms that "*in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.*" But this fulness of the Divinity is stated, in the 19th verse of the preceding chapter—the same to which I have adverted before—to be the *gift of THE FATHER*: "*For it pleased*" (the Father, as the context shows) "*that in him all fulness should dwell.*" In EPH. iii. 19 you will find the Apostle fervently praying that the members of that church might be "*filled unto all the fulness of God.*" Will it be contended that Paul prayed that the divine and human natures might be united in the persons of his converts? Indeed, this text alone—on Mr Bagot's application of the scholastic maxim, *Quicquid accipitur, ad modum accipientis accipitur*, the thing received must be proportioned to the capacity of the receiver; or, in his elegant phraseology, "*a pint bottle will not hold a quart*"—would be sufficient to establish the proper Deity of the Ephesian Christians; for if they were capable of receiving the fulness of the infinite God, they must, on his principle, be infinite themselves. But if no such consequence follows from it in truth, then all the aid lent to the doctrine of the two natures by COL. ii. 9 is proved to amount exactly to nothing, unless we are prepared to follow different rules in the interpretation of similar passages.

I have not found any other texts quoted by Trinitarian writers in support of the doctrine of two natures. But among them, as with Mr Bagot, there is no lack of "inferences" and "deductions" to support the doctrine. They amount to this—as you have seen and heard in this discussion, *usque ad nauseam*—That in some texts Christ is called God (as we admit that in *two*, or at most in *three* passages, he is, though in an inferior sense of the word, as the context shows);

while in other places he is called a man, and described as inferior to the Father. And, in order to reconcile the two sets of passages, it is deemed necessary to have recourse to this supposition. Of course, it is presumed that the doctrine of the two natures will remove the contradiction between the different passages, and get rid of all the difficulty. Let us simply try the validity of this supposition, by applying the doctrine of the two natures to the solution of one or two passages. And, first, I shall take one which I have already quoted in this discussion, and to which therefore Mr Bagot's attention has been turned; so that he will have his arguments and objections ready, if he thinks proper to reply to my reasoning.

In MATT. xx. 20-23, we read that the mother of the sons of Zebedee came to our Lord, and besought him, saying, "Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy kingdom." And after some farther conversation, he thus replied to her supplication: "To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give—except—to those for whom it has been prepared *of my Father.*"

Now, admitting for a moment, and for the sake of the argument, that our Lord Jesus Christ was, as the Athanasian Creed declares, perfect God and perfect man—this petition was most manifestly presented to him in his whole, full, and entire nature. The mother of the sons of Zebedee did not address herself to our Lord's humanity to the exclusion of his Godhead, any more than she made application to his Godhead as distinguished from his humanity. What she wanted was, to obtain the boon which she sought; and this she was desirous of receiving from him in any capacity in which he might be competent to grant it. It was matter of indifference to her and to her sons whether the solicited favour was to come to them through our Lord's human nature, or through his divine nature; or

if it were not perfectly indifferent, the latter would certainly have been the more acceptable channel. They seem never to have doubted our Saviour's ability to bestow the gift which they sought ; and they took the present means of ascertaining whether or not he was disposed to do so. For this purpose the mother, on behalf of her sons, proposed to him the direct petition which has been stated.

And what was our Lord's reply ? It is couched in the most unqualified terms. He makes no allusion to any supposed distinction of natures subsisting in himself, nor to any distinction of the powers and prerogatives appertaining to them respectively. He does not intimate that he wants the *desire* to oblige them by gratifying their wish ; he declares—he most expressly declares—that he wants the *power* to do as they besought him. He declares this, without qualification or restriction : “ To sit on my right hand and on my left, *is NOT MINE to grant !*” And he points to another person as alone able to fulfil their request, by intimating that the dignity which they sought must be reserved for “ those for whom it was prepared of his Father.” And, I would ask, are we to suppose that our Lord, though thus speaking of *himself*, meant only *a part* of himself ? When he said, “ The favour sought is not *mine* to grant,” must not the sons of Zebedee have understood him as speaking in his *whole and entire character* ? And would he be so disingenuous as to affirm concerning the whole of his character, that which could only be affirmed, with truth, of *a petty and insignificant fragment* of his nature ? Yet strange as it may appear, notwithstanding this explicit disavowal on the part of our Saviour, Trinitarians *persist in maintaining* that he had at that very moment full power to grant to these petitioners their request ! And had our Saviour repeated his disclaimer *ever so frequently, and ever so earnestly*, they would not have hesitated to affirm that the matter sought was perfectly within the

compass of his prerogative. Now, I beg to ask, is not this imputing to our Lord the hypocritical practice of mental reservation? Is it not representing him as meanly eluding the application of his followers, by assuring them that he was not competent to do what he could have done in one instant by a single word?

I shall endeavour to make my meaning more clear by a parallel case:—A Right Reverend Father in God is solicited to nominate to a vacant benefice some clergyman, who is supposed to have claims on his consideration. In reply to the application, his Lordship declares, “The living in question is not in my gift; it must be bestowed on the person who may be appointed by the Lord Primate, whose suffragan I am.” It afterwards appears, however, that his Lordship could have disposed of the living exactly as it might have pleased him. We will suppose him taxed with want of candour; and what is his defence? “Oh! certainly, I had full power to present to the benefice, in my capacity as *Bishop of the Diocese*, but I had no such authority in my other capacity, as *A.B. Doctor in Divinity!*” Now, I put it to any man of honourable feeling, whether this would be deemed a proper vindication of his Lordship’s character for sincerity and veracity. Would it satisfy the applicants that they had been fairly dealt with? Would not the disappointed party consider the defence put forth, as an insult superadded to the original deception? Yet precisely similar to this is the conduct which the Orthodox, as they are called, make no scruple of ascribing to our blessed Lord, in the case which we have been considering. Whether such conduct is worthy of the immaculate Jesus, let any sincere Christian, let any *honest man*, lay his hand upon his bosom, and say. I ask, again, for Mr Bagot’s interpretation of the passage!

I had intended to comment on several other passages in our Lord’s life and conversation, with reference to

the doctrine of two natures ; but I perceive I have not time. However, I would briefly advert to a few of the absurdities which would follow from this mode of interpreting Scripture. According to this principle of interpretation, any of the ancient prophets might have declared himself totally ignorant of the very subjects on which he had been supernaturally inspired, and of the very facts which he had been expressly commissioned to reveal ; and if called on for an explanation, he might have replied, with perfect safety, that, *as a mere man*, they did not come within the compass of his knowledge, although, *as a prophet*, he was acquainted with them. Our Lord himself might have truly affirmed on one occasion, what he might, with equal truth, have denied upon another. He might this moment have declared, that he was informed respecting his approaching death ; and the next, he might have protested that he was perfectly ignorant of all that was to befall him. He might, when conversing with his disciples in private, have confessed that he was altogether uninstructed in the counsels of Heaven, and the sublime truths of religion ; while to the Jews in general he announced himself as a teacher sent from God, and able to declare unto them the designs of the Most High. He might have declared to some persons the very day and hour of his future coming, while he owned to others that he was entirely ignorant of the matter. In fact, were it ever so often, and ever so expressly declared in Scripture, that Christ is *not* God equal with the Father, Mr Bagot and his fellow-Trinitarians would not be at all staggered in their belief. They would instantly reply, that the declaration was made respecting the human nature only ! And, finally, the Evangelists, on this principle, would have been justified in declaring that our Lord *never was born*, that he *never suffered on the cross*, that he *never rose again*, or *ascended up to heaven* ! All these facts they might have contradicted expressly, and after-

wards have sheltered themselves under the evasive plea, that none of them (though true of his human nature) could be affirmed of him as God. Can that be a just principle of interpretation from which consequences so frightful necessarily flow?

---

MR BAGOT.—Mr Porter has again informed you that I “parroted” over my texts. I beg, therefore, again to inform him, that if he wishes for a list of the passages I have produced in this discussion, he shall have them; on condition, *that he will meet me here from day to day, and from week to week, under the same rules and regulations as we have been hitherto guided by, and continue the controversy until the whole subject shall be fully discussed.* For, in fact, I have a vast deal more matter upon the question, that would occupy me even a month to produce.

MR PORTER.—I can do without Mr Bagot’s texts, but I am quite willing to meet him here from day to day to carry on the debate, *if EVERY PERSON PRESENT, who heard the previous part of the discussion, will pledge himself to attend regularly to hear it until the close.*

MR BAGOT.—Let it then be put to the vote. If the auditory consent, I consent.

MR PORTER.—A vote will not give me the pledge which I have demanded. I do not want to know the *wish of the majority* of the persons present, but to receive *an assurance from every individual here, that he will attend with us in this place, from day to day, and from week to week, till the whole subject be exhausted, in order that the same identical auditory may be witnesses to the entire discussion throughout.* I am perfectly ready, however, to finish the controversy through the channel of the press. Let Mr Bagot publish his additional matter as a pamphlet, and I shall reply to it in the same way.

MR BAGOT.—This is the same proposal which I have already rejected.

MR PORTER.—By no means. My first proposal, which you rejected, was the publication of a series of essays and replies in the *Bible Christian*; and what I now propose, is the issuing of a series of controversial pamphlets in a separate form.

MR BAGOT.—That is a matter quite of a distinct nature from my present proposal, and does not give a direct reply to it.

MR PORTER.—I plainly avow that I meant to reject Mr Bagot's proposal to continue the oral discussion; and I am surprised, that any one who heard the condition which I stated, should for one moment imagine that I had the slightest intention of agreeing with it. I thought it, from the first, absurd and impracticable; and I simply meant, by my conditional acceptance, to put its absurdity and impracticability in a clear light; for I knew, and could not but know, that it was perfectly vain to expect every member of an auditory such as this, to give a pledge of attendance here from day to day, and from week to week. I now, therefore, tell Mr Bagot, that I will not accept this proposal.

MR BAGOT here said—"According to the regulations, I was not to address you until half an hour after Mr Porter's last address; but, for my part, I do not feel it necessary to cause any delay." Upon which, Mr DOBBS, one of the Chairmen, referred to the printed rules, which stated the arrangement of an interval of half an hour before the closing addresses should commence, and said he thought it would be better for general convenience, that Mr Bagot should delay for at least ten minutes. And that he felt it necessary to make this announcement, lest any person should leave the house (which was at that moment excessively thronged), under the impression that Mr



Bagot would not commence for half an hour. After a few minutes—

MR BAGOT rose and said : I argued this morning, that every objection advanced by Mr Porter against my Scripture proofs in support of worshipping the Son, were equally valid and conclusive objections against those passages which he might advance in support of worshipping the Father ; and I thereby retorted upon him his own principles of reasoning. He has since reminded you, however, in his last address, that the converse of this proposition is equally true ; and that every objection advanced against offering worship to the Father, is an equally valid objection against offering worship to the Son : so that the principle of reasoning which Mr Porter has embodied in this remark may be compared to the flaming sword placed at the entrance of the garden of Eden, which *turned every* way to protect the avenues to the tree of life ! But let him mark the consequence of thus retorting this principle ; for the reply, if worth anything, tends to prove that neither Father nor Son are God—and, in fact, that there is no Deity revealed to us in the Bible at all !

Mr Porter has said a good deal in his last speech against the doctrine of two natures in the mediatorial person of Christ ; and, in the course of illustrating his remarks upon this subject, he brought before your notice the Athanasian Creed. Now, I beg to say that I did not come here to defend creeds, but to maintain and support by arguments the statement of my opinions, which is contained in my two propositions. But as Mr Porter yesterday alluded to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, imagining that I would be foolish enough to divide my own party against myself, by entering upon such an irrelevant discussion ; so to-day, I suppose, he has advanced the Athanasian Creed with the hope that I might so far implicate myself in

a discussion on its contents, as to divide the Orthodox Protestants against me. I must, however, make a remark or two upon this creed. Mr Porter has informed you that I read it to my congregation at least thirteen times in the year. I answer, that I have the advantage of him in that respect, for how does he know whether I read it or not? whereas I know, by sensible evidence, for I myself have heard him this day, that he has read it once in his own Meeting-house. He said much about the meaning of the word PERSON, and argued that it always denotes a distinct being. I admit that it does when used in reference *to men*; but we should exercise great caution when we speak of the nature of Deity, by the use of this and other terms which are borrowed from the ordinary vocabulary of men. Let us be cautious not to strain analogies too far. If God, in compliance with the infirmities of our weak and finite understandings, has condescended to borrow words from the nomenclature of his creatures, we should be cautious lest, by stretching their import beyond what we are fully able to determine, we may seem to encroach upon his kindness, and thus to sin, that grace may abound. I admit that the word *person*, when used in reference to men, denotes a distinct intellectual agent; but I cannot exactly define its signification when used in reference to the Godhead. I observe in Scripture a revelation of three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who together constitute one God. Between these three, there is, I believe, a certain distinction; and I employ the word "person," not in its *strictly proper* sense, as applied to men, but in a *peculiar* sense, to denote that distinction. Let that distinction be what it may, I find it in the Bible, and I therefore believe it, though I do not profess to explain its nature.

Mr Porter argued, that the statements of the Athanasian Creed imply this absurdity, That Christ is eternal and not eternal, omnipotent and not omni-

potent, omniscient and not omniscient, at the same time, and in the same respect. I answer, that he would have found the explanation of all this in the Creed itself, had he attended to the following clauses, which say, that Christ is "Perfect God and perfect man—*equal* to the Father as touching his Godhead, and *inferior* to the Father as touching his manhood—who, although he be God and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ—one, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the manhood into God—one altogether, not by *confusion* of substance, but by unity of person." Christ is eternal, omnipotent, and omniscient, as to his Deity, *but not as to his humanity*. This is a doctrine which I find clearly revealed in Scripture; and it was upon the principle which this doctrine involves that I answered Mr Porter's objection from MARK xiii. 32, in which it is said, that Christ did not know the day or hour of judgment, by showing that though he knew all things in his divine nature, yet, as to his human nature, there were some things, of which this was one, which he did not know. If Mr Porter wishes to establish his argument, let him prove that Christ's *human* knowledge necessarily included in it all his *divine* knowledge, and then I will confess that there is an unanswerable difficulty in MARK xiii. 32; but as long as it is true, that though the greater includes the less, yet the less never can include the greater, I am justified in saying that Christ knows, as to his *divine* nature, many things which he does not know in his *human* nature; although it would be absurd to convert this proposition, and to say that he knows, *as man*, all things which he knows *as God*.

As to Mr Porter's remarks upon 1 TIM. iii. 16, "God was manifest in the flesh," &c., I have said enough about that text already. And I shall merely remark here, that the fact of Griesbach's having inserted Θ:05 in his first edition, and of his having omitted it

in his second, proves that he had a Socinian tendency.

I now proceed to Mr Porter's remarks upon Rom. ix. 5, "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." The original passage is as follows:—

ὧν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

Mr Porter proposed to place a stop after ἐπὶ πάντων and to read the latter clause as a doxology, so as to translate it thus:—

"Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all. God be blessed for ever. Amen.

This, however, was an alteration proposed by Erasmus, and adopted by Locke, from whom Mr Porter has borrowed it. There are two principles connected with this criticism which require to be examined. 1st, The proposed change in the punctuation. 2d, The rendering the latter clause as a doxology.

1. It is a question amongst biblical critics whether the punctuation of Scripture should be regarded as a question of *reading* or *construction*; as no system of punctuation, such as appears in modern MSS., was used by the Apostles in their autographs. Notwithstanding this, however, the question may very fairly be regarded as one of reading; and if so, all antiquity—whether we refer to MSS. versions, fathers, heretics—decides in favour of the commonly received punctuation, with the solitary exception of one manuscript mentioned by Griesbach (No. 47), which places a stop, not after ἐπὶ πάντων, but after *σαρχα*.

But if we regard the proposed punctuation as a question of construction, I argue that it is inadmissible, on account of the dismemberment which it would cause in the phrase, ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός; for Θεός coming *without the article* immediately after ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων must be construed in apposition with it.

In addition to these reasons, I argue for the commonly received punctuation, from the nature of the Apostle's style in this passage, which consists of a *climax* and an *antithesis*. Κατὰ σάρκα, "as concerning the flesh," is evidently one part of an antithesis requiring a corresponding and contrasted member in the succeeding sentence. For the words "as concerning the flesh," naturally suggest to the mind the inquiry, "What was he in *other* respects?" which ought to be answered in the following clause.

For these reasons I reject the alteration in the punctuation which Mr Porter has proposed.

2. I object to reading the last clause of this verse as a doxology, because the construction of the passage would not admit of it. The participle ὢν would be superfluous, and the words, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, would have been sufficient. Also εὐλογητός should be placed before Θεός; as is the case in other similar doxologies in LUKE i. 68; 2 COR. i. 3; EPH. i. 3; 1 PET. i. 3; and in about forty instances in the Septuagint. There is only one case usually advanced as an exception to this form, which occurs in Ps. lxxvii. 19, of the Septuagint: Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εὐλογητός Κυρίου ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν. But the former clause of this verse, which is the part concerned, is of doubtful authority, as there is nothing corresponding to it in the Hebrew; and it may be as well translated thus, "The Lord God *is* blessed."

If GEN. xxvii. 29, "Cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee," should be adduced as an exception to this rule, I answer that it may as well be rendered thus, "Cursed *is* every one that curseth thee, and blessed *is* every one that blesseth thee."

I conclude that if the natural and established order of the words in such doxologies requires that εὐλογητός should be placed before Θεός, no writer who wished to be understood would reverse that order.

I also argue that a doxology in this passage would have interrupted the Apostle's discourse by a long and improbable exclamation. And I also remark that when he was in a "state of sorrow and heaviness," on account of his kinsmen's rejection of Christ, as stated in ver. 2 and 3, a doxology would have been very unsuitable and unnatural. A *prayer* was more congenial with his feelings at the time, and accordingly we find him commencing the next chapter thus: "My heart's desire and *prayer* to God for Israel is, that they may be saved."

I also argue that the verb *εστω* should be added to the text, on the supposition of this passage being a doxology.

And why, I ask, should the Apostle have stopped so suddenly in the *middle* of a description of one person to address a doxology to another, especially when the words *κατα σαρκα*, in the former part of that description, require a response to follow?

For these reasons I reject the proposal of Mr Porter—to read this passage as a doxology.

I therefore regard it as a description of the higher nature of Christ, that nature which is here mentioned in contrast with his being of Jewish extraction, "according to the flesh." And I would beg you to remark that this passage ascribes to the Saviour *four* titles designating Deity. He is "over all," or Lord of the universe. He is "God," a title which is not used in any figurative or subordinate sense here, as is evident from the strong expressions which are associated with it. He is "blessed," *ευλογητος*, not *ευλογημενος*. And I would here request you to remark that *ευλογητος* occurs only four times in the New Testament (in MARK xiv. 61; ROM. i. 25; 2 COR. xi. 31, and in this passage), and is so peculiar a title of the true God, that it is sufficient *of itself* to particularise the Supreme Jehovah, as is evident from the question of the High Priest to our Saviour in MARK xiv. 61, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" *Ευλογημενος*, on the other

hand, is applied to creatures, as in LUKE i. 42, where it is applied to the Virgin Mary—"Blessed art thou among women." We have, lastly, the attribute of Eternity ascribed to Christ in this passage—he is "over all, God blessed for ever. Amen."

In order to obviate the force of my argument for the Deity of Christ, derived from COL. ii. 9, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," Mr Porter referred to EPH. iii. 19, in which the Apostle prays that the Ephesian church might be "filled with all the fulness of God ;" and he told me that I might as well argue for the proper Deity of all the members of that church, in consequence of this passage. Let me examine the comparison here instituted. The passage in COL. ii. 9 is an assertion in the following form in the original: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς; in which the Apostle employs five most emphatic and expressive terms to denote the Deity of Christ: "In him *dwelleth* all the *fulness* of the *Godhead* *bodily*." But the passage in EPH. iii. 19, which Mr Porter considers as parallel to this, is a *prayer*, and of a vastly different nature. He does not pray that all the members of the Ephesian church might be filled "*with* all the fulness of the Godhead bodily ;" but that they might be filled "unto" or "towards" all the fulness of God ;" for the Greek is ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. And who could suppose that the latter passage bears the slightest resemblance to the passage in COL. ii. 9? The Apostle had no intention of representing it as *even possible* that the Ephesian Christians *could* be filled with all the fulness of the Godhead! He merely holds forth the unsullied amplitude of Jehovah's moral glory as the standard *towards* which believers were to endeavour, as it were, to approximate ; upon the same principle upon which the Saviour says to his disciples, "Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect!" But he full well knew that, even in the remotest ages of eternity, the



infinite distance between the creature and the Creator will be definitely preserved ; and that the holiness of the saints, even in their highest state of exaltation, though perfect in its kind, will still continue to be but a shadow of the moral glory of God.

Mr Porter has again adverted to our Saviour's answer to the request of the mother of Zebedee's children, contained in MATT. xx. 23—"To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give ; but it shall be given to them for whom it has been prepared of my Father ;"—and he argued, in reply to my remarks upon this passage, that the mother of Zebedee's children did not make such distinctions as to the two conditions of Christ which I did, but addressed him in reference to his whole person. I beg to ask him, what have the views of this woman to do with the question ? In all probability she was a Socinian, like Nicodemus, or an Arian, like Martha. Mr Porter says, "It is quite plain that Christ had not the power *in any sense* to bestow the solicited honour." But I challenge him to prove this assertion. It is strange that he who elsewhere claims the prerogative of acting by an unlimited power, as in his reply to the leper, "I will, be thou clean," and his declaration to his disciples, "If ye shall ask anything in my name, *I will do it*"—should, in this instance, disclaim that power by an absolute and unqualified declaration. Mr Porter has asserted that the mode of explanation which I have applied to this passage involves a charge of equivocation against the Saviour ; and he endeavoured to illustrate his meaning by a reference to a bishop giving away a good living. Now, as to this *illustration*, all I shall say is that I wish he would make it good in my case ; but as to the logical *principle* involved in it, I must maintain that my explanation of the text does not imply the slightest charge of equivocation against the Saviour. For I request you to attend to the phraseology which Christ adopts. He uses the *present* tense : "To sit on my

right hand and on my left, *is* not mine to give." He does not say, "To sit on my right hand and on my left, *will* not be mine to give." And the reason of his speaking in the *present* tense is obviously this: because *at the time when he spoke these words* he was in a state of humiliation; he had emptied himself of his pre-existent glory; and he could not, consistently with these circumstances, have asserted his right to dispose of the honours and dignities of his kingdom until after he had crushed the serpent's head, and had overcome the powers and principalities of darkness. And all this is declared in REV. iii. 21, where he expressly asserts the very prerogative which Mr Porter thinks that he denies in MATT. xx. 23, "To him that overcometh, *will I grant* to sit with me in my throne, *even as I also overcame*, and am set down with my Father in his throne."

I HAVE NOW DISPOSED OF ALL THE OBJECTIONS WHICH MR PORTER HAS ADVANCED AGAINST THE DEITY OF CHRIST; and I wish, in concluding the argumentative part of this discussion, as far as I am concerned, to propose a plain and simple question to this audience, which contains in it a strong negative argument, not merely for the Deity of Christ, but in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. And I shall propose this question with the view of submitting it to the conscience and candid investigation of every person who denies the Deity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. The question is as follows:—

How do you account for this fact—that in every description presented to our minds, from the beginning of GENESIS to the end of the REVELATION, of what is passing in the invisible heavens, THE SON AND THE HOLY GHOST ARE NEVER ONCE REPRESENTED AS OFFERING WORSHIP, OR DOING HOMAGE, ON THEIR OWN ACCOUNT, AND IN THEIR HIGHEST CHARACTER AND CONDITION, TO ANY SUPERIOR BEING?

I call upon those who deny the Deity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost to account for that astounding circumstance. And let them recollect that angels, as well as men, are represented as worshipping Jehovah—that the Psalmist repeatedly calls upon every order and classification of created intelligences, by a distinct and expressed reference, to worship God; and, as if the animated creation did not afford objects enough upon whom to call, he addresses the sun and moon, the rocks and trees, and mountains and hills, and challenges them to join in the universal anthem of nature, to celebrate the majesty and glory of that Great Being from whom all their brightness and their beauty are derived! And yet the Son and the Holy Ghost are never so appealed to; and yet how much would it have tended to magnify and exalt the glory of Jehovah, that he should have been described, not merely as receiving the homage of all the armies of heaven, and all the inhabitants of the earth, but as being the object of the adoration of two such exalted beings! Let Mr Porter produce an instance of the Son or the Holy Ghost offering worship in heaven on their own account, and in their abstract condition, to any superior being, and the controversy on the subject of the Trinity will be decided in his favour! He may perhaps tell me, that Christ intercedes for his people at the right hand of the Father. I answer, however, that this is not a case in point. The Saviour intercedes in his *official* capacity as Mediator, on account of those for whom he has achieved the work of redemption, and he does not require for himself those blessings for which he intercedes. There is, therefore, no such instance in Scripture of the Son and Holy Ghost offering homage to another being, as would prove their inferiority; and I maintain that this can only be accounted for on the principle of their not being creatures, and because they, with the Father, are the ONE true and everlasting God.

I SHALL NOW DRAW THE GENERAL CONCLUSION FROM THE ENTIRE TRAIN OF REASONING WHICH I HAVE ADVANCED THROUGHOUT THIS DISCUSSION. I came here to argue for the true Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ as the WORD ; and I trust I have been enabled, by the grace of God, to do so in a satisfactory manner. I now lay down this principle in order to illustrate the force of the reasoning I have advanced—THAT NO MAN CAN DENY THE DEITY OF THE SON, WITHOUT AT THE SAME TIME DENYING THE DEITY OF THE FATHER. This principle will appear evident from the following comparison of texts, from which, as a specimen, it will be seen that the Scriptural proofs for the Deity of the Son are as clear and convincing as those for the Deity of the Father, viz.—

*Proofs of the Deity of the Father.*

Abba, Father, *all things* are possible unto thee.—MARK xiv. 36.

Father forgive them; for they know not what they do.—LUKE xxiii. 34.

Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.—LUKE xxiii. 46.

The true worshippers shall *worship* the Father.—JOHN iv. 21.

My Father *worketh* hitherto.—JOHN v. 17.

What things soever the Father doeth.—JOHN v. 19.

As the Father raiseth up the dead, and *quickeneth* them.—JOHN v. 21.

Even as they *honour* the Father.—JOHN v. 23.

As the Father *knoweth* me.—JOHN x. 15.

*Proofs of the Deity of the Son.*

He is able to subdue *all things* unto himself.—PHIL. iii. 21.

Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.—ACTS vii. 60.

Lord Jesus receive my spirit.—ACTS vii. 59.

Let all the angels of God *worship* him.—HEB. i. 6.

And I *work*.—JOHN v. 17.

The same doeth the Son likewise.—JOHN v. 19.

Even so the Son *quickeneth* whom *he* will.—JOHN v. 21.

That all men should *honour* the Son.—JOHN v. 23.

Even so *know* I the Father.—JOHN x. 15.

Now, let these two classes of texts be considered in juxtaposition ; let the declarations in one be compared attentively with the declarations in the other. You have one class of passages which ascribe the attributes of Deity to the Father ; and you have, on the other hand, a similar class of texts which ascribe the very same attributes to the Son :—I argue, then, that any principle of reasoning which Mr Porter may adopt in order to overthrow the doctrine of the true Deity of

Christ which I derive from the latter, will virtually and necessarily act as a lever to upset the doctrine of the true Deity of the Father, which Mr Porter derives from the former. So that he must either involve himself in the responsibility of arguing upon principles which would represent the Bible as a system of Atheism, in which no Deity is revealed at all ; or he must agree with me in receiving as scriptural, the doctrine which I now state as my general conclusion from this entire discussion—that THE LORD JESUS CHRIST POSSESSES, AS THE WORD, THE SAME ETERNITY, KNOWLEDGE, POWER, AUTHORITY, PREROGATIVES, AND GODHEAD WITH THE FATHER, AND IS ONE WITH HIM IN ALL ATTRIBUTES.

---

I shall now employ the remainder of my time in taking advantage of the peculiar privilege which the Lord has conferred upon me—of raising my voice within *these walls*, to proclaim those glorious statements of his Gospel which are intimately connected with the doctrine of the Saviour's Deity ; and on account of which I consider that subject to be supremely important, and have embraced the present opportunity of defending it by argument. If it could be proved to me that the doctrine of the true Deity of Christ were nothing more than a piece of intellectual information, invented in order to glare or astonish the thinking powers of man ;—If it could be proved that it were a mere abstract theory, divested of every practical influence—then I should at once renounce and discard it, because I am informed in Scripture that Christianity is a system of moral motives, and that every constituent doctrine of Christianity is “according to godliness.” I argue, then, for the Deity of Christ, because it is the primary and most essential principle of the Gospel ; because it is the nucleus—the vitality—the essence—the axiom—the very originating principle of the religion of Jesus Christ ! The doctrine of the Saviour's Deity is, as it were, the key-stone, which by its inserted

pressure binds and consolidates into one compact body the whole system of divine truth ! The sentiments which men entertain in reference to the personal dignity of Christ constitute a test and index of their general creed ; and are, as it were, a sort of moral barometer, by which we can measure the elevation or depression of their opinions upon the other doctrines of the Gospel. Those, for instance, who believe that Christ was nothing more than a man, must rely exclusively upon their own performances for justification, pardon, and peace, in time, and for glory and everlasting happiness in eternity ; and as they superadd to this belief an opinion that the Holy Ghost is nothing more than an attribute, they must believe that they can attain to that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord, by their own endeavours to sanctify and purify themselves, independently of that process which the Bible reveals as exclusively of the operation of the Spirit of God. And—if we ascend somewhat higher—the man who believes that Christ was an angel or a superangelic being, may perhaps profess to avail himself to a certain extent of *his* services, and, by adding the merit of Christ to his own good works, may thereby imagine that he is resting his plea upon a sure foundation. But the Scripture recognises no such basis of justification : a righteousness composed of such heterogeneous qualities can never stand the test of the scrutinising eye of the Almighty ! The man who does not believe in the true Deity of Christ, can never entertain an adequate or correct opinion in reference to the other doctrines of the Gospel—he can have no proper idea of that system of salvation which can justify the sinner here, and glorify the believer hereafter. If Christ be not God, of what avail is his work ? If Christ were only a creature, every work he achieved, every action he performed, was necessary to fulfil those infinite obligations under which *he* lay, in common with all created beings, to serve, to honour, and to obey his

Creator. If Christ were only a creature commissioned to perform the mere work of a prophet or a messenger, might not some inferior being have been selected from a lower class of created existences, who would have discharged the office as well? and might not the “only-begotten Son of God” have been exempted from a commission attended with so much suffering and disgrace? And how could the Holy Spirit sanctify, unless he is divine? He could have no command over the sentiments or feelings of men—no power to control their will—no faculty of universal and perpetual presence, by virtue of which he could dwell in every member of the church, and carry on the work of sanctification in *every* believer’s soul.

But more awful consequences still are attendant upon a denial of the Deity of Christ: it neutralises and destroys the *infinite* character of the Father’s love. OBSERVE the strong and emphatic terms in which the Bible speaks of the love of God: “God *so* loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish but have eternal life.”—“He that *spared* not his own Son, but freely gave *him* up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?”—“In *this* was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.” “Herein is love”—as if there were love in nothing else—“not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.” Here the love of God is estimated and valued by the dignity of his Son: but if Christ were merely a *creature*, what would become of the *infinite* character of the Father’s love? Could not that same physical omnipotence of the Eternal, which, upon Mr Porter’s principles, commanded the Lord Jesus Christ into existence, have created millions of similarly exalted beings to supply the place of that *one* which God had surrendered as an atonement for sin? Surely



the doctrine which represents the Saviour as merely a creature, deriving his existence and attributes at an immeasurable distance from his Creator, altogether annihilates the love of the Father to the world.

But observe the influence which the denial of the Saviour's Deity has in reference to the love of Christ himself. The Scriptures are replete with animated representations of the length and breadth, and height and depth of the love of Christ, which passeth all understanding ! If Christ, however, were nothing more than a *created* being, what becomes of the infinite condescension of his love—the extreme disinterestedness of that philanthropy which no human or angelic intellect can scan ? Let me refer you to that description to which Mr Porter has alluded, of the mediatorial exaltation of the Redeemer, which you will find in PHIL. ii. 9-11 : “ Wherefore (in consequence of his previous condescension) God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name ; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth ; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.” Now, let me appeal to your candid and impartial judgments, where could have been the *disinterestedness* in a *created* being, no matter how exalted, submitting to undergo the temporary humiliation which the Saviour underwent—enduring a few short hours of suffering, no matter how intense, with this glorious prospect before his view, that, when the period of his debasement had expired, he should be raised to a transcendent elevation at the right hand of God—promoted, as it were, into a state of competition with the majesty, the power, and prerogatives of the Eternal—appointed to the office of Universal Judge ; and should, in fact, be represented as superseding his Creator in the execution of those works which none but Deity could achieve ? If Christ were a creature, his philanthropy was not disinterested

—his love was dictated by motives of personal ambition and of self-aggrandisement. For I lay down *this* as an incontrovertible principle, that there must have been, even in the *highest* mediatorial exaltation of Christ, something of *condescension* and *humiliation* in order to preserve the disinterested character of his love to man. In undertaking the office of Mediator, his primary motive must have been to release those sinful creatures who were lost in a state of moral dereliction and transgression, and for whom he interposed by that sublime act of philanthropy which the Gospel describes. He must have been actuated by a desire to promote their spiritual prosperity and happiness, both here and hereafter. But unless we admit that he was true God, one with the Father, we cannot contemplate his mediatorial interference in this point of view ; but we neutralise altogether the infinity of his love, and represent the work which he has achieved as an act of selfishness, and not of benevolence ! Alas ! alas ! how these systems which deny the true Deity of Christ—how they scorch and wither the sentiments of men in reference to the *infinity* of the love of God ! Methinks they are like as if Satan had kindled a torch in the lowest flames of hell, in order to burn up and consume the love of the Father and the Son ; but with which he has only succeeded in producing a lurid glare, that has dazzled the intellectual faculties of man, so as to prevent their discerning the light of the glory and love of God as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ !

But let me turn your attention to the sad effect which a denial of the Saviour's Deity has upon the prospects of man for eternity. It is a truth written, as with a sunbeam, upon every page of Scripture, that man is by nature a fallen, a guilty, a condemned creature, obnoxious to the righteous judgment of God. We are told that "the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked"—that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God : " Jehovah himself is repre-

sented as looking down from heaven upon the children of men to investigate their characters with that omniscient ken by which he explores the utmost boundaries of the illimitable universe, and pronouncing this solemn verdict—"There is none righteous ; no, *not one*," and the Apostle Paul, when reminding the Ephesian Church of their past unregenerate condition, says that they were "children of wrath, even as others." If man, then, be in a guilty and condemned state by nature, it is an awful and important question, *How* shall he obtain pardon and justification with God, on account of his past transgressions ? and *how* shall his sinful and unholy nature be sanctified and prepared for admission into the realms of everlasting glory ? Can personal *repentance* on the part of the sinner obliterate the crime of which he has been guilty, so as to reinstate him into the condition of a sinless and unfallen being ? Unquestionably not. For *whatever* act *has been* performed by God, or angels, or by man, must remain for ever written upon the pages of eternity, never to be erased ; and, therefore, no subsequent repentance on the sinner's part—no tears of sorrow or contrition can ever blot out his past transgressions ; nor could even the united tears of angels erase the record of those offences for which man is brought in guilty before God ! Can, then, subsequent *obedience* achieve the work of the sinner's justification ? This, alas ! will prove as ineffectual as repentance ; for though we should render to God a perfect obedience for the remainder of our lives, still the sin we *have* committed is sufficient to procure our conviction and condemnation ; for the wages of sin is death ! Shall we, then, have recourse to the abstract mercy of God as the foundation upon which to rest our hope of pardon ? This is the Unitarian's plea : "I believe," he says, "that God is merciful ; and I repose in his kindness, and trust he will have compassion upon me." Alas, my friends ! it was bad enough that Mr Porter should have yesterday adopted the algebraic

principle of neutralising one text of Scripture by another ; but to carry up this principle to a contemplation of the character of God, and to bring it into collision with the attributes of Jehovah, and thus to set his mercy against his justice—his compassion against his truth—his grace against his holiness, and thereby to neutralise and annihilate one class of attributes by another, is a guilt that is direful, blasphemous, and indescribable, equal to the crime for which Satan was banished out of heaven into hell ! Methinks if I could look back upon that important epoch in eternity when God in the council-chambers of heaven devised the atonement—when the eternal THREE sat down, as it were, to constitute and plan the scheme of redemption—the axiom they assumed, the postulate they adopted, the principle they considered essentially necessary to be at all hazards maintained was this—That God's justice must be satisfied before he could become the justifier of the ungodly ; that his holiness and truth must be vindicated by a satisfactory compensation before his mercy could be dispensed to the fallen family of man ; and that the law must be vindicated by the fulfilment of its precepts, and the endurance of its penalties, before the sinner could be freed from its condemnation and justified freely by the grace of God. To meet these requirements the Saviour became incarnate, and achieved a work which constitutes a basis of justification which meets the demands of God and the necessities of man. *He* wrought out a perfect righteousness for his people. *He* was wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement by which our peace has been effected was laid on *him*, and by *his* stripes we are healed. This is the view which the Bible gives of the philanthropy of the Saviour : “ He is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth ”—“ He was made a curse for us ; ” and observe how he sustained that curse :—sorrow was the very essence of the curse as denounced against Adam ;

so Christ was a man of sorrows. The loss of the communion of God was another item in the curse against sin ; and this the Saviour sustained when, in all the agonies of conscious dereliction, he exclaimed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ?" Death was another portion of the curse ; for the law has said, "The soul that sinneth, it shall surely die ;" and, as the sinner's substitute and representative, the Saviour fulfilled the law and died upon the cross that we might live through him. We can account for the sufferings and death of the Saviour upon no other principle. For how could we reconcile it with the justice and mercy of a righteous God, that a sinless and holy being should have undergone so much *superfluous* suffering, if the work which he came to achieve were merely that of a messenger or prophet, which might have been discharged without such an awful expense of agony as Christ endured ? But we must admit the atonement of the Saviour upon scriptural grounds ; for we are told that "once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the *sacrifice of himself*;" that "He who knew no sin was made sin," or a sin-offering, "for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him ;" and that "by one sacrifice he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." And now let me show the necessary connection which there is between the Deity of the Saviour and his righteousness and atonement. We know that no *created* or *finite* being can perform more than what is his duty to do ; for, after all he may have done, he will still be only an unprofitable servant. The very essence and fundamental principle of the work of Christ, consisting of his righteousness and atonement, is this, that it is an act of *supererogation* intended to be *transferred* to the account and benefit of others. But no created being could execute such a *transferable* work ; and if Christ were a creature, his righteousness was required for his own personal justification, and could not be communicated as

the groundwork of acceptance to man. We must, then, admit his Deity in order to give to the work which he achieved in his humanity a value corresponding with the infinite dignity of his character, and commensurate with the necessities of the sinner. But what, on the other hand, is the natural effect of a denial of the Saviour's Deity? It annihilates the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, and elevates *self* as a Saviour in *his* stead!—for if Christ be not our Saviour, we must be resting on our own works for salvation. And now, my friends, I would desire affectionately and earnestly to bring home this important subject to the consciences of every individual in this vast assembly. I would wish to propose this question personally to my friend Mr Porter, and I would say to him, and to each of you—As you are now in the presence of that God who will judge the quick and dead at his appearing and his kingdom, can you place your hands upon your hearts and say, in the full assurance of that faith which is the believer's privilege—"We *give thanks* unto the Father, which *hath* made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who *hath* delivered us from the power of darkness and *hath* translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son; in whom we *have* redemption through his blood, even *the forgiveness of sins?*" Attend here to the force of the word "have." The privileges of the believer are as much in *possession* as in *prospect*. Every one who is in Christ, not having his own righteousness, but *his*, has the forgiveness of sins as a present blessing, which he obtained by grace when he was enabled to believe; as the Apostle says to the Ephesian Church (chap. iv. 32), when he directs them "to be kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, *hath forgiven* them;" and the Apostle Peter describes the believer's privilege in language proportionably strong, where he says (1 PET. ii. 25)—"Ye *were* as sheep going astray, but *are now* returned unto the Shep-



herd and Bishop of your souls." I say, then, it is the believer's privilege to have, in consequence of the redemption that is in Christ, in present and actual possession, the full, free, and irreversible pardon of all his transgressions. And why should not this be his privilege? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect, whom God himself hath justified? Who shall condemn those for whom the Saviour died? And when Christ expired upon Calvary, did he perform an incomplete or inefficient work? Surely not; or else he never would have uttered that expiring exclamation which marked the triumphant consummation of his sacrifice—"It is finished!" The object of his achievement was to remove the veil of the curse which interposed between the condition of man and the forgiving kindness and love of the Eternal; and when he pronounced these words he had taken away *every obstacle* which prevented the mercy of Jehovah from shining in all its amplitude upon the moral ruins of this apostate world. Christ, then, did not leave his work half finished, but brought it to a glorious and benignant termination; and there is *now* nothing to prevent the very vilest sinner from looking to a crucified Saviour, and rejoicing in the doctrine of a full and gracious pardon, which is a *reflection from the cross* upon the soul of every Christian that looketh unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of his Faith. But how, you will ask, shall the sinner become interested in the Saviour's work? How shall he appropriate to himself the blessings which Christ has purchased by his death? The Bible says, in reply to this inquiry, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." FAITH is represented in Scripture as the connecting link which binds the sinner to the Saviour, and gives him an appropriating interest in the Saviour's work, and in every blessing which the interference of Christ has obtained. "He that *believeth* on him is not condemned." "He that *believeth* on the Son *hath* everlasting life." Christ



is the *primary* object of the sinner's faith ; and every blessing, such as justification, pardon, peace, and holiness, are the *secondary* objects of the sinner's faith, reflected back upon the soul from a believing view of the Saviour as he is held forth in the Gospel ; for Christ is made unto us of God, wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption ; and *in him* we have redemption through *his* blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace. And what are the benefits which result to the sinner from a *believing* view of the Saviour ? Being *justified* by faith, he *has* peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Justification, which implies the acceptance of our persons, inclusive of the pardon of our sins, is the first gift of the grace of God in the Saviour. And observe that the Apostle does not represent justification as the object of *hope*, but as the object of *faith*. We are not merely directed to *hope*, with the Unitarian, that God *will* pardon our sins at the hour of death, or at the day of judgment—we are not merely privileged to *hope* in his mercy—but we are directed in the Gospel to look to the finished work of Emmanuel, and to believe that in him we *have* redemption, even the forgiveness of our sins. I repeat it : The Christian is not justified by *hope*, but by *faith*. He is not merely to expect a *future* pardon, but to believe in a *present* pardon. Such is the concurrent testimony of the Gospel : “ There is *now* therefore *no condemnation* to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” “ I write unto you, little children,” says the beloved disciple, “ because your sins *are* forgiven you for his name's sake.” And the Apostle Paul, in a passage already referred to, says, “ Being justified by faith, we *have* peace with God,” evidently implying that the believer is a *pardoned* and *accepted* sinner, and that he *has* joy and peace in believing that his sins have been freely pardoned, through the reconciliation effected by Christ. HOPE has another and a different object from

justification. It refers principally to the glory and blessedness of immortality. The basis, the residence, the object, the tendency of hope, are strikingly described by the Apostle in COL. i. 27, where he says that the riches of the mystery of the Gospel is CHRIST IN THE BELIEVER THE HOPE OF GLORY. Observe the force and beauty of this declaration: The *root* of every attainment and principle of spiritual fertility is "Christ;" the *soil* in which that root is planted by faith, and in which it germinates, is "in you;" the ascending *stem* which rises from earth to heaven, under the influence of the Spirit, is "hope;" the *fruit* which will be displayed in rich luxuriance within the Paradise of God, blooming in the atmosphere of immortality, is "glory;"—a glory which eye hath not seen, which ear hath not heard, and which it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive; for it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when Christ shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is!

Now I assert, most explicitly, that an abandonment of the doctrine of the DEITY OF CHRIST obliterates the atonement, and frustrates the entire work of the Saviour. In fact, if Christ be not God, he is not a Saviour: if he be not a Saviour, there is no salvation; for there is no *other* name given under heaven amongst men whereby we can be saved. If there be no salvation, there can be no peace of conscience in the sinner's soul—no hope of glory to shed a calm and tranquil lustre upon the otherwise dark and perplexing path, which leads from time to the unexplored regions of eternity. And if there be no peace of conscience here, and no hope of glory hereafter, there is but one alternative—a fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation, which will destroy the transgressors. Would to God, my friends,—and I speak with all the sincerity and solemnity of feeling with which, as a minister of the gospel, I ought to be impressed, when I address immortal and accountable beings upon those subjects which concern

eternity,—would to God that every individual who now hears me—whether amongst those who hold what are termed Unitarian views, or amongst those of other denominations, who are destitute of the vitality and power of godliness—were at this moment savingly converted to God, and that this were the hour of your justification, so that you might depart from this assembly with the Spirit of God speaking peace to your consciences; and that, as the Eunuch went on his way rejoicing when Philip had spoken to him of Christ, so you might be enabled to walk through your earthly pilgrimage, rejoicing in that name which is above every name; being washed and sanctified, and accepted through him who died for your sins, and rose again for your justification; evincing your love to the Redeemer by keeping his commandments, and looking for that redemption which will be fully consummated at the second coming of Christ, who shall change the bodies of our humiliation, so as to transform them into a likeness with his glorified body, by that energy wherewith he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.

And now—may that great Being, in whose smile the angels of heaven exist—whose glory, and majesty, and mercy, constitute the very atmosphere from which the unfallen and sainted inmates of the universe derive all their moral beauty and felicity—may He graciously pardon in me, his unworthy servant, whatever, throughout this discussion, I have spoken inconsistently with the sacred truths of his word; and may he—by a display of that moral omnipotence which he has ever at command—cause the brightness and illumination which surrounds his throne gradually to expand, until it shall comprehend within its ample and uncircumscribed circumference the dark and dismal intellects of those who reject his Gospel and deny his Son!

---

At the close of Mr Bagot's address, MR PORTER said that he had a question which he would be glad

to propose to that gentleman, if the regulations permitted.

MR BAGOT stated that, in his opinion, the 4th rule, which gave the privilege of asking such questions, did not contemplate the closing address of either party. In this decision the Chairmen concurred, and the question was not put.

---

MR PORTER.—Throughout the whole of this controversy, I have always been pleased to hear Mr Bagot raise his powerful voice to its highest pitch, and to find him delivering his sentiments with those graces of oratory, of which he is so consummate a master: for I have uniformly observed, that, in proportion to the redundancy of his declamation, was the deficiency of his argument; and, in the inverse ratio of the sound emitted, was the quantity of sense which the sound conveyed. You may imagine, therefore, with what delight I heard him commence the *sermon on the Atonement*, which he has just delivered. You may imagine the pleasure which I felt when I beheld Mr Bagot turn away from the subject which has brought us here this day, to indulge in a harangue which had no more connection with that important topic than with *any other* in the whole circle of controversial theology! But there was one point in his harangue, which—standing before you, and before the public, as a man, I trust, of some pretensions to an honest name—I feel it incumbent upon me not to pass over in silence. I refer to that part of his speech in which Mr Bagot talked so loudly and so fervently concerning the guilt of BLASPHEMY, as attaching itself to those who hold certain opinions, which, whether truly or falsely, he imputed to me, and those who generally agree with me in theological opinion. Now, I appeal to all who are here present, whether, when two gentlemen meet to make arrangements for the public discussion of a great

subject, it could be anticipated that this was to be the way in which the debate should be conducted? I appeal to every gentleman who hears me, and who is acquainted with the practice of debate in public assemblies, whether this is the usage which prevails,—I do not say among ministers of religion only, but among any men who support a respectable rank in society,—when they come together to consider in common the arguments on both sides of a disputed question? Is it not, among persons of this description, the first rule of debate, that nothing shall be imputed to an opponent that implies criminality, *gratuitously*, or without direct proof? And, I ask, What blacker charge could be advanced against me—a professed follower of the Lord Jesus Christ, and a minister of his Holy Gospel—than the abominable and atrocious one of BLASPHEMY?—such blasphemy, too, that, compared with it, the crime for which Satan was expelled from heaven sinks into insignificance! I hope that Mr Bagot himself, on reflection, will be sorry for the expression, and will retract it; but, until it be retracted, I never will reciprocate with him the language of friendship! He is so fond of calling me his *friend*, that he repeated the phrase, even after—and almost immediately after—imputing to me *the crime of blasphemy*! I say again, that, until the offensive expression is retracted, I will not bestow that name on him. I know what is due to my own character. This hand is clean; and never shall it grasp in friendship that of the man who attempts to fasten upon me this odious imputation.

Mr Bagot has not failed in his last speech—nor, indeed, in almost any previous one—to taunt me with keeping something of my real opinions in reserve; and he has even extended the accusation to that religious body with which it is my happiness and—humanly speaking—my pride to be connected. It is an honour and a happiness to be connected with the Unitarian body, and I feel it so; for I feel and glory in the con-

viction that, with a body of men more liberal, more intelligent, more inspired with the charity of the Gospel, I could not be connected. Mr Bagot has taunted me, and the other members of this religious body, with keeping something in reserve, and with not avowing our real sentiments. But I appeal to every individual who hears me now, and has heard me throughout this entire discussion, whether, if chargeable with any fault in the management of my argument, it has not been one of a directly opposite kind. I appeal to every person who dispassionately listened to me, whether I have not repeatedly made admissions which I knew would be laid hold of to be turned against me—which, in point of fact, were so turned against me ; and from which, had I chosen to practise *the wisdom of the serpent*, I should cautiously have abstained ! This charge, therefore, I fearlessly pronounce, is not founded on fact, and will not tell with the public who have attended here throughout this debate. But to prevent this accusation from being circulated and credited by those who, not having been here in person, will take their accounts of the controversy from vague rumour and anonymous report, I now repeat, on purpose that it may appear in the printed narrative of these proceedings, the leading articles of the faith which I hold concerning the subjects debated between myself and Mr Bagot ; and they are these :—

I believe, then, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain a full, perfect, and explicit revelation of God's most holy will ; that they are the only infallible standard of truth and duty ; and that they are mercifully designed, and eminently calculated, to promote the dearest interests of men, as rational, moral, and accountable beings.

I believe that these divine records unite with the voice of reason and of nature in proclaiming THE GREAT TRUTH, which is the foundation of all true religion, that there is ONE, and only ONE, ETERNAL and

SELF-EXISTENT GOD—infinite in power, wisdom, goodness, justice, holiness, mercy, and all other possible perfections. Upon this immovable basis I rest my faith and hope ; and I believe that a departure from this great principle led to all the superstition and idolatry of ancient days, and has produced all the corruptions of Christianity which have prevailed in more modern times. I cling, therefore, to the unrivalled Supremacy of the One God, the Father, with a fidelity which cannot be shaken ; and I maintain, as *the plainest of all the doctrines taught in Scripture*, the STRICT UNITY of that great God, who is not only the God of the universe, but, as the Bible declares, is also the GOD AND FATHER OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Whilst I thus believe, on the sure warrant of Scripture, that *there is One God*, I equally believe, on the same divine authority, that there is *one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*. I believe that this glorious and gracious being, who is called in Scripture the Saviour and the Son of God, possessed glory with his Father before the world was, and was beloved of the Father before the foundation of the world. I believe that he came down from heaven to do the will of his Father who sent him upon earth. I believe that he is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation, who became flesh and tabernacled among men, full of grace and truth ; and, finally, that he is the exalted being whom the Father hath appointed to be the Judge of the living and of the dead.

But while I believe the words of Holy Writ which testify the previous existence and glory of our Divine Master, and which animate my soul with gratitude for his amazing condescension in coming to save sinners, I also believe that the Scriptures are not less express and explicit on the subject of his subordination and inferiority to the Father.

I believe that this great doctrine, which vindicates



the Unity and Supremacy of God, runs through the whole of the New Testament. I believe that it was the consistent and constant declaration of our Lord himself; who, on every occasion, ascribed his power and wisdom and authority to the Father as its source, and represented himself only as the agent whom the Father employed in effecting his purposes of mercy to the human race. I believe that the apostolic writings are filled with texts, maintaining, in the clearest terms, the unrivalled Supremacy of the Father; convincing us that there is but One God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ—that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God; and informing us, that at the last, when all things shall be subdued unto the Son, then shall the Son himself be put into subjection to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. These things I believe, and these things I maintain and teach.

That there are difficulties connected with the particulars of this assemblage of religious truths I have always felt, and have acknowledged, in the course of this debate, with a candour which I should have been glad to see imitated. I have allowed, and I allow, that there are difficulties attached to my peculiar views of the Christian doctrine. But, let me ask, what system of faith is there, or has there ever been in the world, that has not been attended with its difficulties and its doubts? Where is the point of faith—where is the principle of religion, whether natural or revealed, which has not been disputed and objected to—disputed and objected to, not by men of captious and supercilious minds alone—not by those merely who seek to be wise above what is written, but by persons whom we cannot but believe, in the exercise of that Christian charity which we all hope to receive, to have been, in the main, sincere and good men, and candid and honest inquirers after truth? Now, when such men are driven into doubt or disbelief, there must be

difficulties. To say that my system has its difficulties, is only saying that it partakes of a property which is common to every doctrine under the sun.

And since I am taunted with these admitted difficulties connected with my creed, I ask, are there none to be found in that system which my reverend opponent has defended? Is there no difficult, no perplexing circumstance, connected with the faith which he professes, either in the statements of its creed, or in the proof of its doctrines? If there be no difficulties in Trinitarianism, why has there been that reluctance, against which I have so often and so loudly exclaimed, to bring forward the doctrine of the Trinity as a subject of discussion in this controversy? Why is it that we heard, from my reverend opponent, scarcely a word upon that point, until now it comes out at the eleventh hour, when there is no time to canvass its arguments, and examine its foundation? If there be no difficulties in the scheme of the Orthodox, how comes it, I would ask, that all the Unitarian Churches that exist throughout the world were originally formed of members gathered out of Trinitarian folds? If there are no difficulties connected with their system, how comes it that the aspect of the world would justify the Orthodox in applying to their Unitarian brethren the words of John the Baptist to our Lord, "*He must increase, but I must decrease*"? And how is it that we sometimes hear it said, by orthodox authorities themselves, that Unitarianism is like the *lion's den* in the fable—

*Vestigia nulla retrorsum!*

But I go farther. If there be no doubts and difficulties connected with the Trinitarian system, how comes it that Trinitarians themselves are so little united, even upon the true statement of the doctrine of the Trinity? That there are differences of opinion subsisting between various classes of Unitarians, and more especially between those among us who admit the pre-existence

of Christ as a Scripture doctrine, and those who cannot so receive it, I have no wish to conceal, and have never affected to deny. Upon this point I have repeatedly, and in very express terms, declared to Mr Bagot my own peculiar views, so that he could have no room for doubt or ambiguity. But I refused from the very first to make them the subject of controversy with Mr Bagot. I reserved them, and reserve them still, to be settled with my Unitarian brethren in our own calm, dispassionate, rational, and charitable mode of conducting such discussions. Since, however, these differences of opinion among Unitarians have been once and again referred to, I would ask Mr Bagot whether there are no differences of opinion, even *on the doctrine of the Trinity itself*, among *orthodox* men—persons who call themselves, and are called by others, *Trinitarians*; and who would be in no small degree indignant were the justice of the appellation denied? If there are no differences of opinion among the nominally Orthodox on this subject, how is it that in their controversies with each other we hear of the *Ciceronian* Trinity, and the *Cartesian* Trinity, and the *Aristotelian* Trinity, and the *Platonic* Trinity; all of them designated by names borrowed from profane philosophy—names which are confessedly unknown to the writers of the New Testament, and to which the Word of God gives no countenance? If we are to embrace the doctrine of the Trinity, are we to believe, I would submissively inquire,—are we to believe with Dr WALLIS, whose opinion has been sanctioned by a decree of the University of Oxford, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are no more three distinct intelligent persons, than the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob are three distinct Gods? Or are we to acknowledge, with Dr SHERLOCK, Bishop of London, that the Three Persons of the Trinity are as much three distinct infinite minds as Peter, James, and John are three men? an opinion which the learned body before-

named decreed to be "*false, impious, and heretical*"! Are we to believe, with the Athanasian Creed, that the Father is Almighty, the Son is Almighty, and the Holy Ghost is Almighty, and yet there are not three Almighties, there is but one Almighty? Or are we to believe, with Dr BURNET, that the Son and the Holy Ghost are created beings, and are God only by the indwelling of the Father's Deity? Are we to believe, with Bishop GASTRELL, that the Father includes the whole idea of God, *and something more*; that the Son includes the whole idea of God, *and something more*; and that the Holy Ghost includes the whole idea of God, *and something more*; while *all three together* make exactly one God, *and nothing more*? Or are we to believe with Bishop BURGESS, that the Father is a person, but not a being; the Son is a person, but not a being; the Holy Ghost is a person, but not a being: and that these three personal *nonentities* make one entire and perfect being? Such the unintelligible jargon which is substituted for the simple doctrine of Scripture, that there is *One God*, THE FATHER, and *One Lord*, JESUS CHRIST! It is evident that each of these learned divines believed in a Trinity of his own; and each must have regarded all the rest as ignorant, or deniers of the true God. Had my reverend opponent considered these differences between the Orthodox themselves, on a doctrine which, as his creed declares, unless a man believes, "he shall without doubt perish everlastingly," perhaps his sarcasms about the diversities of opinion among Unitarians, on points of far inferior moment, would have been spared. At all events, if any argument be founded on such diversities, I have said enough to show that it applies to his own system with much greater force than it does to mine.

In the various addresses which I delivered since the first day of this discussion, I was anxious to lay before you as much as the time allotted to me would enable me to bring forward, of the clear, full, and distinct

evidence which the New Testament affords in proof of the doctrine which I embodied in the two propositions whose defence I undertook. On account of the number of texts which I had to adduce, it was not easy for me to crowd even a copious selection from the entire number into my speeches, and at the same time to answer all the arguments adduced by Mr Bagot. In order to do justice to my cause, I felt myself obliged to take up a good part of the entire time allotted to me, in laying before you the direct evidence on my own side of the argument. It was not easy, having so much business of my own to perform, to follow Mr Bagot in all his devious labyrinths, to trace him in every turn, and hunt him out of those intricate coverts in which his mysterious doctrines were concealed. Having now a little time remaining, I shall not follow the example which he has set, of deviating from the subject of debate, but shall employ my leisure in canvassing some of the reasonings which he has brought forward. These arguments I shall endeavour to state as fairly and as impartially as if I believed in their cogency myself. Mr Bagot, you must remember, argued with great confidence for the clear proof of the proper Deity of the Word to be derived from 1 JOHN v. 20:

And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true: *and we are in him that is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life.*

(The latter part of the verse is in the original, καὶ ἐσμεν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ· οὗτός ἐστιν, κ.τ.λ.)

Now Mr Bagot affirmed that these words of the Apostle John must be viewed as giving to our Lord Jesus Christ the title of "*the true God.*" If so, every one will admit that the text affords a very weighty argument in favour of his proper Deity. He was quite right in intimating that Unitarians do not conceive that the words "*true God and eternal life*" are to be refer-

red to our Lord Jesus Christ, but to "*Him that is true*," who is mentioned in the preceding clause, and is there found to be the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ. The question amounts to this: Are we to understand the last clause as affirming that "*Jesus Christ is the true God and eternal life*?" or simply as declaring that "*He who is true, is the true God and eternal life*?" The latter is the interpretation adopted by the Unitarian expositors; the former by the Orthodox. Mr Bagot argued in opposition to the Unitarian, and in support of the Orthodox interpretation of this text, that the pronoun *ὁὗτος* (*this*) must refer to *Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ* (*Jesus Christ*), as *the last antecedent* in the sentence with which the pronoun can agree. And so unquestionably it is; but let me assure you that that consummate master of criticism, Professor GRIESBACH, to whose edition of the New Testament I have so often called your attention, and whose perfect candour and sincerity I never heard impugned until I mounted this platform, marks the words *Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ* (*Jesus Christ*), on which this criticism is founded, as of *doubtful authority*. If they are removed from the text, the word *αὐτοῦ* (*his*),—which undoubtedly refers to "*Him that is true*" in the preceding clause,—becomes the last antecedent; and the whole passage will read literally thus, "*And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us understanding, that we may know Him that is true: and we are in Him that is true, [whilst] in the Son of Him. This is the true God and eternal life:*"—or, more agreeably to the English idiom: "*We are in him that is true, [whilst] in the Son of him who is the true God and eternal life.*" No satisfactory argument can be founded on a basis so frail as a doubtful and uncertain reading.

But after all, even allowing the received text to stand unaltered, where is the proof that *ὁὗτος* (*this*) must of necessity refer to the last antecedent, "*Jesus Christ*," and not to the preceding one, "*Him that is*

*true*”? Unless such proof be afforded, this text cannot be quoted in support of the proper Deity of the Word; for the Unitarian exposition of it *may be* the true one. I venture to affirm, such proof cannot be produced; nay, I could produce numerous instances from Scripture of the very contrary. I turn, for example, to—

ACTS iv. 10-12. Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth *this man* stand before you whole. *This* (*οὗτος*) is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

Apply Mr Bagot's principle to this text: assume that the pronoun *οὗτος* (this) must of necessity refer to the *immediate* antecedent, and not to the *more remote*, and you make the Apostle Peter declare to the rulers of the Jews, that the *impotent man* whom he had healed was “the stone which the builders rejected, but which became the head of the corner;” and not only so, but that he was *the only medium of salvation* vouchsafed by God to the human race. Again, we read in—

ACTS vii. 17-19. But when the time of the promise drew nigh, which God had sworn to Abraham, the people grew and multiplied in Egypt, till another king arose, who knew not *Joseph*. *The same* (*οὗτος*, “this person,”) *dealt subtilely* with our kindred, and *evil entreated* our fathers, so that they cast out their young children, to the end they might not live.

Now, unless we refer the pronoun *οὗτος* to a remote antecedent, passing over that which immediately precedes it, we shall find in these words a declaration that *the Patriarch Joseph* was the persecutor of the Israelitish people, and *not* the cruel and perfidious king of Egypt.

Or, let us apply Mr Bagot's principle to a passage which occurs in the writings of the very Apostle whose words we are considering, in the very next



Epistle to that in which this text is found, and we shall obtain some unexpected results.

2 JOHN, ver. 7. For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that *Jesus Christ* is come in the flesh. *This (ὁὔτος) is a deceiver and an antichrist.*

On Mr Bagot's principle of interpretation, the disciple whom Jesus loved applies the last two epithets to his beloved Lord and Master! And now, having demonstrated that the proposed rule of syntax makes our blessed Lord to be a deceiver and an antichrist, I follow Mr Bagot's example by *returning it to himself*, to make of it what farther use he pleases.

But I am not yet done with this text, 1 JOHN v. 20. You will remember—at least such of you as have attended during the progress of this discussion—that Mr Bagot, with an air of magisterial authority, laid it down as a principle of Greek construction, that the term which occurs in the predicate of a proposition in which it is found never admits the article. Compassionating my ignorance of syntax, he inquired, with reference to some remarks of mine upon JOHN i. 1, “Did I not know the reason why the word Θεός, in the latter clause of that verse, was found without the article?” and then proceeded to state the rule which I have just mentioned as the reason, and as an unquestionable position. In support of the view which I took of the construction in that passage, I had previously adduced the express testimony of EUSEBIUS, a learned and eminently conscientious writer, who was a Greek by birth, spoke the Greek language, and wrote in it, to and for those who, like himself, spoke that language from their infancy. His testimony I gave at length, explicitly confirming the opinion which I had expressed, that the grammatical structure of the sentence in JOHN i. 1 would have admitted the article in the predicate, had the Evangelist meant to convey the idea that the Word was God in the strict and proper sense. I also referred to the opinion of ORIGEN—per-

haps the most learned of all the Greek fathers of the church, and especially versed in subjects of criticism—which is precisely to the same effect, though I had not time to quote the passage in full, owing to its length. One might have expected that the judgment of EUSEBIUS and ORIGEN would have carried *some* weight in the determination of a question such as this. But you will remember how Mr Bagot set himself, as a Greek scholar, far above EUSEBIUS and ORIGEN, so that he did not even deign to notice their opinion; but, turning to me, in astonishment at my ignorance of so obvious a truth, proceeded to enlighten me by laying down, for my information, the rule that the predicate of a proposition does not admit the article.

Now I refer you once more to 1 JOHN v. 20, which, be it remembered, is an example of his own selection—a text which he himself has adduced, and put prominently forward, both in his *Abstract* and in this discussion; and with which, therefore, he ought to be supposed to be well acquainted. I take that very clause (“THIS IS THE TRUE GOD AND ETERNAL LIFE”) on which his argument was built; and, turning to the Greek Testament, I find in the original—

Ὁ ὁσός ἐστίν Ὁ ἀληθινός Θεός καὶ Ἡ Ζωὴ αἰώνιος·

#### THE ARTICLE IN THE PREDICATE !

Who is ignorant of Greek syntax now? Which of us requires to be taught the common rules and principles of construction?

Nor is this a solitary example of the article occurring in the predicate of a proposition. Look, for instance, to another passage in the same Epistle,—

1 JOHN ii. 7. The old commandment is the word which ye have heard from the beginning.

In the Greek : ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ παλαιὰ ἐστίν Ὁ λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς.—*the article in the predicate!*

And again in—

I JOHN iii. 4. Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for *sin is the transgression of the law*.

The original of the last clause is, καὶ ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία—*the article in the predicate!*

And still further, we read in that noted passage,—

I JOHN v. 6. This is he that came by water and blood, [even] Jesus Christ: not by water only, but by water and blood; and it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because *the Spirit is truth*.

These last words are in the Greek, τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια—*the article in the predicate!*

I have selected all these examples from one not very long epistle, written by the evangelist John; but we need not go so far away from the first verse of his Gospel for a proof that the rule laid down by Mr Bagot will not bear the test of examination. In the *fourth* verse of the very same chapter (which is, in English, “In him was life, and the life was the light of men”) we have, in the original, ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων—*the article in the predicate!*

After these specimens, you will be able to judge either of Mr Bagot’s caution or his scholarship. You find him hazarding assertions which the very same context on which he comments is sufficient to refute. I think you will agree with me that, if the explanation which I proposed be good and valid in other respects, there is nothing in the canon of my reverend opponent to prevent its adoption.

Now you will remember that my object in proposing my criticism on JOHN i. 1, was to establish a distinction between the meaning of the term *God*, in the former part of the verse, where it is found in the original *with* the article, and the corresponding term in the last member of the text, where the article is wanting. I argued that, unless we recognise this distinction, we fall into the absurdity of making the evangelist declare that *the word is the SAME God WITH whom he is*. My

position has been questioned by Mr Bagot ; and, therefore, it is to be presumed that he maintains that the term " God " is to be understood in the same sense in both clauses ; and, in point of fact, he adduced his criticism expressly to refute my observation. Let us suppose, then, that the term is to be understood in the *same sense* in both clauses of the verse, and inquire to what results this principle will lead. The Apostle declares that—

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Now Mr Bagot tells us that in this verse the term *Word* means the divine nature of Christ, or, as it is commonly expressed, "*God the Son* ;" and first let us suppose that by the word *God* we are to understand " God the Father." The whole will then read thus :

In the beginning was God the Son, and God the Son was with God the Father, and *God the Son was God the Father !*

" God the Son *was* God the Father !" This is downright heresy ; confounding the persons, and therefore subjecting its author to the anathema of the Athanasian Creed ! This explanation will not do ; and, therefore, we must have recourse to some other plan of interpreting the passage. Let us then suppose, as before, that by the *Word* we are to understand the divine nature of Christ—that is, God the Son, the second person in the Trinity ; and that by the term *God* we are to understand the whole Trinity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. On this view of the phraseology, the assertion of the Apostle will be as follows :

In the beginning was God the Son (*the second person of the Trinity*), and God the Son (*the second person of the Trinity*) was with *the whole Trinity* (God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost) ; and God the Son (*the second person of the Trinity*) **WAS THE WHOLE TRINITY, GOD THE FATHER, GOD THE SON, AND GOD THE HOLY GHOST !**

“The second person of the Trinity was the Trinity !” This is a worse heresy than before ; for it not only confounds two persons of the triad, but mixes up the whole three in inextricable confusion ; and thus it will be found, on trial, that every attempt to make either sense or orthodoxy out of this verse will fail, so long as we affix the same signification to the term “ *God* ” in the two clauses of the verse. *It must*, then, at last, be conceded, that *it is to be understood in two distinct senses*, in the first and second members of the verse ; and if this be conceded, the whole question is yielded to the Unitarians, so far as it depends upon the interpretation of this passage. I defy Mr Bagot, and I defy any rational being, to put any consistent or intelligible interpretation upon this passage, unless he admits that distinction in the signification of the word “ *God* ” for which I contended : and this distinction, if once admitted, takes away the whole basis of his reasoning.

There is another passage on which Mr Bagot seemed to lay great stress, and which he repeatedly brought forward. Having omitted to notice it before, and being desirous of treating his arguments with all possible respect, which I should not do by leaving them unreplyed to, when time permits me to reply, I shall now give it a brief consideration. The passage to which I refer is the exclamation of Thomas, on witnessing our Saviour alive after his resurrection, “ *My Lord, and My God !* ” It is recorded in—

JOHN XX. 28. Thomas answered and said unto him, MY LORD, and MY GOD !

Mr Bagot takes it for granted that these words are addressed to Christ, and that they contain a recognition of his proper Deity : but they may—just as *naturally* as regards the mere *verbal construction*, and *much more so* as relates to the *sense and meaning of the terms* employed—be considered as an ejaculation, or exclamation of wonder and surprise, addressed by the Apostle to THE

SUPREME BEING, by whose power the miracle which his eyes beheld must have been effected. Thus interpreted, they afford no proof of the Deity of Christ, but, on the contrary, contain another of the many instances of religious worship addressed to God, the Father, only. I know it may be supposed that the words "*Thomas answered and said unto him,*" distinctly mark out Jesus himself as the person addressed in the subsequent words ; but the Scripture idiom will not support the criticism. There are many cases in which, in the language of Scripture, one person is declared to have "answered" or "said" unto another words which were not addressed to that other person directly, but which were only spoken with reference to him, or to something that had fallen from him. An example of this kind, bearing, in some respects, a striking resemblance to the phrase employed by the Apostle Thomas, occurs in 1 SAM. xx. 12, "*And Jonathan said unto David, O LORD GOD OF ISRAEL,*" &c. No one supposes that, by this address, Jonathan meant to recognise his friend and comrade as the Lord JEHOVAH and the God of Israel. All that he intended, evidently, was to call God to witness the covenant which he was about to make ; the words, "*Lord God of Israel,*" not being addressed to David, notwithstanding their seeming connexion with the preceding clause. There is nothing to prevent the same principle of explanation from being applied to the passage before us. If so, it cannot be considered as a proof of Mr Bagot's position. This is no "algebraic process of positive and negative quantities," as Mr Bagot has repeatedly denominated similar observations made by me. I am not employing one passage of Scripture to destroy or neutralise another, but simply to explain its meaning. Unitarianism does not require the destruction of a single text in the whole Bible. It has no contradictions in itself, nor does it assume or allow that such exist in the Scriptures ; for its own foundation is the simple meaning and direct

assertion of the Word of God. All that I have done in this and former instances is to employ those passages which are clear and obvious to assist in determining the signification of similar language occurring in texts which would otherwise be liable to some degree of obscurity and doubt. Nor is this a novel principle: it is nothing but the adherence to a rule of interpretation long since propounded, and universally recognised.

Again, Mr Bagot places much reliance on the words of our Saviour in JOHN v. 22, 23:—

For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; *that all [men] should honour the Son even as they honour the Father.*

In these very words, however, the Father is represented as the source and origin of the Son's judicial power, and of that honour which accrues to him from the exercise of his functions as Judge. Besides, the latter clause, if understood to mean that the Son occupies as high a rank in the scale of existence as the Father does, would be totally inconsistent with Mr Bagot's own principles. He holds that the term *Son* denotes the complex character of Christ as Mediator; and he has over and over again declared that Christ, in his mediatorial character, is subordinate to God the Father. The text, therefore, on his own showing, would imply that equal honour is due to the subordinate person and to his superior, which would be destructive of the very idea of subordination. But there is no necessity for recurring to such abstract reasoning. It is evident that the whole force of Mr Bagot's inference depends on the meaning which we attach to the connecting particle, *even as* (*καθως*), which he seemingly understands to signify the same as *equally*, or *on a par with*. But in the Lexicon of the orthodox critic, SCHLEUSNER, we find that this particle frequently signifies "inasmuch as," "since," "because" (*siquidem, quoniam, propterea quod*); and to prove that it has this signification, he adduces the following apposite and satisfactory examples:—



JOHN xvii. 1, 2. These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven and said, Father! the hour is come: glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee. As (*καθως*) thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.

ROM. i. 28. And *as* (*καθως*) they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over, &c.

In these passages, and in many others, the particle *καθως* manifestly means *since* or *because*; and to explain it as signifying *equally*, or *on a par*, would render the passages unintelligible. That such is the meaning also in JOHN v. 23 is plain from the explanation which our Lord himself subjoins in the last clause of the verse, "He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him." The passage therefore must be understood as declaring that "the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men may honour the Son, *inasmuch as, since, or because*, they honour the Father: for he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him." This is no strange or unheard of principle in the conduct of human affairs. In Ireland, at least, we are acquainted with a case that is completely analogous. We are governed by a Lord Lieutenant acting in the name and by the authority of his Majesty the King. To the Vicegerent's lawful commands we are bound, on an allegiance to his royal master, to yield obedience; and any act of rebellion against him would be, both in conscience and law, an act of rebellion against the Sovereign. But all this does not make the Lord Lieutenant, King of Ireland.

Mr Bagot, in the early part of this discussion, built an argument for the proper Deity of the Word on JER. xxiii. 5, 6, in which, as he maintained, the name of "the Lord" [or Jehovah] "our righteousness" is attributed by the prophet to Christ. In my reply I affirmed that, if this passage proved the proper Deity of Christ, the application of the *very same name* to the city of Jerusalem, in JER. xxiii. 16, would equally de-

monstrate the proper Deity of that city. Commenting on this observation of mine, my reverend opponent inquires, Whether I have forgotten my Hebrew? or how else can I suppose that the latter passage will bear the interpretation put upon it in the Common Version which I quoted? To this inquiry I can only answer that perhaps I have forgotten some of my Hebrew. I confess that in my case this is possible, for I believe *I once had a little Hebrew to forget*. In this particular passage Mr Bagot seems to think he has caught me between the horns of a dilemma. Either, as he argues, I have forgotten how to translate the original correctly, or I have chosen to reason, knowingly, from the mistakes of the Common Version, in which, as he asserts, the text in question (JER. xxxiii. 15, 16) is erroneously rendered. To this I can, with perfect confidence, reply that I am quite sure that every one who knows me will acquit me of the criminality of arguing on a basis which I knew to be unsound, and will give me entire credit for veracity when I affirm that I would not have brought forward the translation of JER. xxxiii. 16, had I known or believed it to be incorrect. But I go further than this. My reference to JER. xxxiii. 16 was not a hasty or heedless allusion. I knew well the objections which had been stated to the Common Translation, and I had carefully examined the original, with a view to determine their force. I brought forward that text in argument because I was and am satisfied that the objections to the common rendering are perfectly vain and futile. I know, and allow, that the text, *as pointed*, would most naturally, *though not exclusively*, admit of a different translation. But I likewise know—and herein I have the almost unanimous consent of all modern Hebrew scholars of any note—that the points are of comparatively recent date, being an invention of the Masorites in the middle ages. If this comparatively modern addition to the text be disregarded, as it evidently ought, then the most obvious and natu-

ral interpretation of JER. xxxiii. 16, becomes literally thus :—

And this [is that] which shall be called [or named] upon her, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

And I do maintain that this Hebraic expression is perfectly equivalent to the English phrase adopted by King James's translators, "And this is the name wherewith she shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." And I argue confidently that this is a perfectly parallel passage to that in JER. xxiii. 5, 6, to illustrate which I quoted it. When I consider the manner in which Mr Bagot has spoken of the renderings of the Authorised Version throughout this debate, I cannot help recalling to mind the demand which he made on me before it was commenced, when he declared that the *only standard* on which he could consent to carry on this discussion was *the Authorised Version of the Scriptures*, admitting the genuineness, authenticity, and divine authority of all and every part of the books contained in it. And taking into account the number of instances in which he has not only impugned its renderings, but, as in the instance just exhibited, treated them *with contempt*, I feel myself justified in charging him with seeking to impose on me a condition which he himself could not have conscientiously accepted.

There are several other texts noted on the paper before me, and numerous statements made by Mr Bagot, upon which it would be highly expedient in me to comment, did time permit. But I am obliged to pass most of them over unnoticed. To one point, however, I shall refer ; although I feel that, in doing so, I am sacrificing the opportunity of advertng to other subjects of great importance to the cause which I stand forward to defend, and which I had fully intended to bring under your consideration. But I perceive I must abandon all hope of doing so, for I must stop when my hour is expired.

Mr Bagot reasoned yesterday, in his closing speech, against the supposition, that an inferior or subordinate agent could, *by possibility*, be employed in executing the work of creation. He went so far as to assert, that not even the Almighty could endow a being distinct from himself with ability to execute such a task. He admitted that the work of creation itself was *finite*; yet argued that no being, but the Supreme Being, could possibly have been enabled to perform it. I answer all such hypothetic statements by referring to JOHN i. 3; for there I find that the employment of a subordinate agent is *expressly declared*: "All things," says the Evangelist, "were made through"—that is, *by means of*—"him;" that is, the Word, as an inferior agent or instrument: for so the phrase must be understood, both in the original and in the common version. And I find a similar assertion in HEB. i. 1, 2, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, *through* whom also he hath made the worlds." In both these passages, and in several others to which there is not time to advert, the employment of subordinate agency in the work of creation is plainly and explicitly declared; so plainly in the latter passage, even if the Trinitarian version be allowed to stand, that nothing can be more distinct. Mr Bagot, in his remarks upon this subject, protested against the *à priori* method of reasoning; but I appeal to yourselves, whether—when, in order to turn aside the arguments of the Unitarians, he denied the competency of the Almighty to endow a created being with power to create a world—he was not himself compelled to

"boldly take the *à priori* road,  
And reason downwards,"

till he doubted the power of God to impart to a creature the ability to execute a finite operation. From

this remarkable specimen you will be able to judge whether it is Mr Bagot or I who limits the power of Omnipotence ! From the example now before you, you will be able to determine which of us it is that takes out of the Bible a God possessed of those divine attributes which are necessary to render the Supreme Being the object of our confidence and faith ! I beseech you to remember it is not I, but Mr Bagot, who asserts that it is not possible for God to employ an inferior being as his instrument in accomplishing any object whatsoever which he may wish to effect through such instrumentality.

I thank Mr Bagot for the admission which he made, when, in the course of his reasonings on the subject of Creative Power, he stated that there cannot possibly be two almighty beings or persons in the universe. I thank him for this admission, because it seems to me directly to contradict the articles of his own faith, and to confirm and establish the Unitarian doctrine. Did time permit, I would, as Mr Bagot has expressed it, take the loan of this principle for a little, to show how it may be turned against himself, and against the Athanasian Creed, which declares that "the Father is Almighty, the Son is Almighty, and the Holy Ghost is Almighty." Now this seems to approach very closely to the assertion of three Almighties ; but yet, as the creed itself is compelled to allow, "there are not three Almighties—there is but one Almighty." I need not recall to the minds of some among you the exclamation which burst from the lips of the Scottish dealer, who, when attending public worship while on his travels in England, happened to hear this creed recited in alternate verses by the clergyman and his clerk !

I have only time to notice one other statement made by Mr Bagot. He threw out, in the course of his remarks, if I mistake not, on creation, a challenge to me to produce a single passage in which the power of our Saviour, properly so called, was declared to be derived.

He admitted that our Saviour had received *authority* (ἐξουσία) from the Father; but he denied that *the power* which he possessed (δύναμις) was ever traced to any superior source. He challenged me to produce a passage in which any such declaration is made respecting the Son; and, unless I am greatly mistaken, offered to rest the whole argument on this issue. In reference to this challenge, I remark, that even if it were not expressly stated in Scripture that our Lord's *power* was derived, still the fact of his *authority* being communicated would completely overturn the idea of his Supreme Divinity: for who could bestow authority, ἐξουσίαν, on the Supreme Being? But I meet Mr Bagot on his own ground; and, accepting his challenge, I beg to turn his attention and yours to ACTS x. 38, "*How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, AND WITH POWER;*" which is, in the original, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ΔΥΝΑΜΕΙ! Here, beyond all question, the very term δύναμις is used in reference to our Saviour, and coupled with an express declaration that it was *communicated* to him: so that my reverend opponent might now give up the argument.

I find I have now but four minutes to close my address. I rejoice that this controversy has taken place. I rejoice that I took that view of my duty as a Unitarian minister, and as a friend to the cause of truth, which induced me to accept the invitation or suggestion of Mr Bagot—if so he is pleased to call it, which others have construed as a challenge to the whole Unitarian body—and which impelled me to step forward to meet this redoubted paladin. I am glad, I say, that I thus stepped forward; and this consciousness shall be a lesson to me, as long as I live, never to allow any public attack to be made on my principles—which are dear to me as my life itself;—not less dear to me than Mr Bagot's are to him, though I dislike talking so

much about them—to which I shall not reply, when circumstances bring it under my particular notice. True, I am but a weak, feeble being; but when a great cause is at stake, to which I have devoted my life, so long as I have my reason spared by the God who conferred it, and so long as health endures, I will not suffer that great and glorious cause to be tarnished for one moment by any reluctance on my part to appear before an unwilling auditory—by any selfish timidity, backwardness, or reserve. I am satisfied this discussion has already advanced those doctrines I advocated, and will advance them still further. But let me not be misunderstood. I do not expect to make a single immediate convert. I know too well the power of prepossessions which are early engrafted in the mind—I know too well the pains that are taken to bring up the rising generation under the influence of feelings of horror towards my opinions—to expect that anything I can do or say should prevail against that force of prejudice which exists in many minds. But should only a few inquiring spirits—and such are to be found in every society—be induced to look into the Word of God, and there read whether these things indeed are so—should this be the result in any candid minds, and especially should it be the result in any considerable number of instances, I am satisfied the discussion in which I have been engaged must tend to the growth of those principles for which I have contended. For truth is mighty, and it will prevail; and we have a promise that a time will come, and a hope that it is rapidly approaching, when “JEHOVAH SHALL BE ONE, AND HIS NAME ONE.”

---

At the termination of this address, Mr Bagot stepped forward to propose a series of questions to Mr Porter; but Mr ANDREWS, one of the Chairmen, objected to his doing so, on the ground of his having refused to receive a question from Mr Porter after the



conclusion of *his* last address. Mr Bagot immediately said that this had escaped his recollection, and he at once acquiesced in the Chairman's decision, but requested Mr Porter to allow him to make an explanation in reference to his use of the word "blasphemy." To this Mr Porter assented ; and—

MR BAGOT said.—Mr Porter has shown, by some remarks in his last address, that he understood me to have associated the charge of blasphemy *personally* with him. I beg to say I had no such intention. If he wishes to know what my feelings are towards him and those who agree with him in religious opinion, he will find them stated in the 10th chapter of the Epistle of Paul to the ROMANS, at the 1st verse, where the Apostle says, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, THAT THEY MAY BE SAVED."

MR PORTER.—When I said that if the offensive words which I understood to be applied to me were retracted, I should give the hand of friendship to Mr Bagot, I spoke in the sincerity of my soul ; and thus I redeem the pledge.

Mr Porter presented to Mr Bagot his hand, which he cordially shook.

The Chairmen then announced that the discussion had terminated, and the assembly dispersed.

THE END.





Relig. Times. ~~Head.~~

11309

Author (John Scott) Porter and Daniel Bayot

Title Authentic report of the discussion on the Unitarian controversy

DATE.

NAME OF BORROWER.

University of Toronto  
Library

DO NOT  
REMOVE  
THE  
CARD  
FROM  
THIS  
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket  
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"  
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

